arXiv:1611.08817v1 [math.NA] 27 Nov 2016

On Nonconvex and Nonsmooth Regularization for Contrast-Preserving Variational Signal and Image Restoration *

Chunlin Wu† Zhi-Fang Liu† Shuang Wen†

November 29, 2016

Abstract

Variational methods have become an important kind of methods in signal and image restoration - a typical inverse problem. One important minimization model consists of the squared ℓ_2 data fidelity (corresponding to Gaussian noise) and a regularization term constructed by a regularization function (potential function) composed of first order difference operators (basic and widely used linear operators in regularization). Various potential functions have been proposed in the literature, among which nonconvex or nonsmooth at zero regularizers have been proven to produce neat edges. As contrasts are also important features in signals and images, we study, in this paper, the possibility of contrast-preserving restoration by variational methods. To describe the contrast preservation more clearly, we take a typical example to discuss our idea, with some results extended to general cases. We show that, in both 1D and 2D, any convex or smooth regularization (satisfying the very basic assumptions in the literature) based variational model is impossible or with low probabilities to preserve edge contrasts. Consequently, we suggest to try nonconvex and nonsmooth regularization functions, especially those flat on $(\tau, +\infty)$ for some positive τ. We present a framework based on truncated regularization (with truncated ℓ_p proposed in the literature previously). Some basic analysis in 1D theoretically demonstrate its better contrast-preserving ability. We also give numerical algorithms in 2D, where global minimizers of each subproblem (either convex or nonconvenx) can be obtained. Experiments numerically show the advantages of the framework.

Keywords: signal and image restoration, contrast-preserving, variational method, regularization, potential function, nonconvex and nonsmooth, truncated regularization, probability.

AMS 2010 Subject Classification: 68U10, 94A08, 49N45, 49N60

1 Introduction

A digital signal (1D) or image (2D) records the intensity information of a scene or object in our real world. Mathematically it can be regarded as a uniform sampling from a univariate or multivariate function. Due to some limitations of the sampling procedure, the signal or image data usually contain degradations such as noise and blur. Signal and image restoration is to recover the underlying clean and clear data, which is a fundamental task in image data processing. The most important and usually difficult target is to keep the edges (discontinuities) and their contrasts.

*This work was supported by the NSF of China under grants 11301289 and 11531013.

†School of Mathematical Sciences, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, China(wucl@nankai.edu.cn, liuzhifang0628@gmail.com, wenshuang13@126.com).

In recent decades variational methods (energy minimization methods) have become an important kind of methods for this typical inverse problem [42], especially when the degradation operator is not an identity. The energy function usually contains two terms: regularization term and data fidelity term (see Section 2 for details). In a very common and important case with Gaussian noise, which will be considered in this paper, the data fidelity term is a squared ℓ_2 norm. A basic choice for the regularization term is constructed by a regularization function composed of the discrete gradient operator, i.e., the first order finite difference operator. (Of course one may consider the second order, third order finite differences or wavelet frames.) The key of the method is therefore to choose a suitable regularization function. So far in the image processing literature, several regularization functions have been proposed, including convex ones, smooth ones, and nonconvex and nonsmooth ones, in either the variational or statistical setting.

The convex or smooth potential functions were proposed in [38, 4, 18] or [17, 19, 23, 37, 43],*etc.* For a smooth regularization based energy method, the Euler-Lagrange equation is a good way to analyze the variational model; see, e.g., [1] and [8] where some useful conditions on the regularization function were suggested to pursuit edge preservation effect. It is well known that the both convex and smooth ℓ_2 regularization over-smoothes edges. A typical nonsmooth but convex potential function is the ℓ_1 norm, which, when composed of the gradient operator, is the popular total variation (TV) regularization. Due to its edge preservation ability, TV attracted much attention and has many extensions such as [7, 5]; see the references in [40] for more. Convex variational models often benefit from efficient algorithms. However, as Meyer's remarkable example [26] shows, TV regularization suffers from a contrast reduction effect.

Earlier nonconvex and nonsmooth regularization methods have been presented in [16, 3, 23, 14, 15, 28, 27, 39], *etc.* In these methods, some auxiliary variables were used to serve as markers of edges or some nonconvex and nonsmooth regularization functions were used to produce neat edges. In the latter case, a series of papers [29, 30, 11, 12, 31, 32] systematically analyzed the properties of the minimizers of nonconvex and nonsmooth variational models. As noticed before that model validation is very hard in general, these analysis shows theoretically the advantages of nonconvex and nonsmooth models in image restoration. One most important result is that nonconvex and nonsmooth models produce neat edges. Very recently nonconvex and nonsmooth regularization obtained more and more attention in variational image restoration [34, 33, 13, 47, 10, 25, 20, 35, 41, 2, 21, 22, 36].

In this paper we study variational restoration models from another viewpoint - *contrast-preserving* signal and image restoration. In contrast-preserving restoration, the recovered signal or image is expected to keep not only neat edges, but also the contrasts of the edges. This is the wonderful wish of the signal and image restoration problems. As stated before, some edge preserving variational methods, such as TV regularization based models, may still suffer from contrast reduction effect. This paper shows that any convex or smooth regularization (satisfying the very basic assumptions) based variational model is impossible or with low probabilities to preserve edge contrasts. We therefore suggest to try nonconvex and nonsmooth potential functions, especially those flat on $(\tau, +\infty)$ for some positive τ. Also, a general framework based on truncated regularization (with truncated ℓ_p proposed in the literature) will be presented. We then give some basic analysis in 1D and numerical algorithms with experiments in 2D for this framework, showing its better contrast preservation ability.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives the variational signal and image restoration models. We list some basic assumptions and provide some preliminary analysis in section 3. In section 4 and 5, we show the negative validation of convex and smooth regularization in contrast-preserving restoration in 1D and 2D, respectively. Section 6 is the framework of truncated regularization. In section 7, we give some basic theoretical analysis for 1D signal restoration using truncated regularization. In section 8, we present numerical methods to solve the 2D image restoration models with truncated regularization, as well as numerical experiments. Section 9 concludes the paper.

2 The variational signal and image restoration models

2.1 1D signal

We assume that a 1D signal $f \in \mathbb{R}^K$ is a degradation of $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{R}^N$:

$$f = A\underline{u} + n,$$

where A is a matrix representing a linear operator such as a blur convolution; $n = \{n_i : 1 \le i \le K\}$ is random noise. Without loss of generality, $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ can be regarded a uniform sampling of a function $\underline{U}(x)$ defined on the interval $[0,1]$. That is, $\underline{u}_i = \underline{U}((i-\frac{1}{2})h), 1 \le i \le N$, $h = \frac{1}{N}$. N is sometimes called the resolution of $\underline{u}$. As for the noise, we consider in this paper the most common and important case, where $\{n_i : 1 \le i \le K\}$ are independently and identically distributed gaussian random variables, and more specifically, $n_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2), 1 \le i \le K$.

The restoration problem is to recover $\underline{u}$ from f. A widely used generic model is

$$\min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left\{ \begin{array}{rl} E(u) = & \displaystyle\sum_{1 \le i \le N} \varphi((\nabla_x u)_i) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|Au - f\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^K} \\ = & \displaystyle\sum_{1 \le i \le N} \rho(|(\nabla_x u)_i|) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|Au - f\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^K} \end{array} \right\}, \tag{2.1}$$

with different choices of $\rho(\cdot)$. Here the ∇_x is the forward difference operator with specific boundary condition, e.g., periodic boundary condition or Neumann boundary condition.

2.2 2D image

Without loss of generality, we assume that a 2D image $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ is a degradation of $\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$:

$$\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{A}\underline{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{n},$$

where $\mathbf{A}$ is a linear operator such as a blur convolution (note here we do not assume its matrix representation); $\mathbf{n} = \{\mathbf{n}_{i,j}, 1 \le i,j \le K\}$ is random noise. $\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ can be regarded as a uniform sampling of a function $\underline{\mathbf{U}}(x,y)$ defined on the square $[0,1] \times [0,1]$. That is, $\underline{\mathbf{u}}_{i,j} = \underline{\mathbf{U}}((i-\frac{1}{2})h, (j-\frac{1}{2})h), 1 \le i,j \le N$, $h = \frac{1}{N}$. $N \times N$ is sometimes called the resolution of $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$. Again here we consider Gaussian noise, where $\{\mathbf{n}_{i,j}, 1 \le i,j \le K\}$ are independently and identically distributed gaussian random variables with $\mathbf{n}_{i,j} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2), 1 \le i,j \le K$.

In 2D there are two widely used generic minimization models to recover $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ from $\mathbf{f}$. The first is the following anisotropic model:

$$\min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}} \left\{ \begin{array}{rl} E_{\text{ani}}(\mathbf{u}) = & \displaystyle\sum_{1 \le i,j \le N} (\varphi((\nabla_x \mathbf{u})_{i,j}) + \varphi((\nabla_y \mathbf{u})_{i,j})) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|\mathbf{Au} - \mathbf{f}\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^{K \times K}} \\ = & \displaystyle\sum_{1 \le i,j \le N} (\rho(|(\nabla_x \mathbf{u})_{i,j}|) + \rho(|(\nabla_y \mathbf{u})_{i,j}|)) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|\mathbf{Au} - \mathbf{f}\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^{K \times K}} \end{array} \right\}, \tag{2.2}$$

with different choices of $\rho(\cdot)$. Here the ∇_x and ∇_y are the forward difference operators with specific boundary condition. Sometimes we denote $\nabla = (\nabla_x, \nabla_y)$ for simplicity.

The second is the so called isotropic model:

$$\min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}} \left\{ \begin{array}{rl} E_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u}) = & \displaystyle\sum_{1 \le i,j \le N} \psi((\nabla_x \mathbf{u})_{i,j}, (\nabla_y \mathbf{u})_{i,j}) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|\mathbf{Au} - \mathbf{f}\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^{K \times K}} \\ = & \displaystyle\sum_{1 \le i,j \le N} \rho(\sqrt{(\nabla_x \mathbf{u})^2_{i,j} + (\nabla_y \mathbf{u})^2_{i,j}}) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|\mathbf{Au} - \mathbf{f}\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^{K \times K}} \end{array} \right\}, \tag{2.3}$$

with different choices of the regularizer $\rho(\cdot)$. Again $(\nabla_x, \nabla_y) = \nabla$ are the forward difference operators with specific boundary condition.

We note that, in the minimization problems (2.1)(2.2)(2.3), the sampling (resolution) parameter h can be absorbed in the parameters of the potential function ρ or the fidelity parameter α. Without loss of generality, we assume $h = 1$ in the following sections, since in real applications the resolution $h > 0$ is usually fixed and always has positive lower bound.

3 Basic assumptions on $\rho(\cdot)$ and preliminary analysis

We make some basic assumptions about $\rho(\cdot)$ and provide some preliminary analysis, which will be useful in next sections.

We first list some basic assumptions about $\rho(\cdot)$:

(AS1) $\rho(0) = 0, \rho(s) < +\infty, \forall s < +\infty$ with 0 as its strict minimizer;

(AS2) $\rho(s)$ is increasing over $[0, \infty)$;

(AS3) $\forall s > 0$, $\rho'(s-)$ and $\rho'(s+)$ exist.

Almost all regularizers in the image processing literature meet these assumptions.

These basic assumptions indicate the following properties of the $\varphi(\cdot)$ and $\psi(\cdot, \cdot)$.

Proposition 3.1 *Under the assumptions (AS1)(AS2)(AS3), we have*
1. $\varphi(\cdot)$ satisfies

(1) $\varphi(-x) = \varphi(x)$;

(2) $\varphi(0) = 0$ and 0 is its strict minimizer;

(3) $\varphi(x)$ is decreasing over $(-\infty, 0]$ and increasing over $[0, \infty)$;

(4) For $\forall x \neq 0$, $\varphi'(x-) = -\varphi'(-x+)$ and $\varphi'(x+) = -\varphi'(-x-)$.

2. $\psi(\cdot, \cdot)$ satisfies

(1) For $\forall \theta \in [0, 2\pi]$, $\psi(T_\theta(x, y)) = \psi(x, y)$, where T_θ is the 2D rotation matrix;

(2) $\psi(0, 0) = 0$ and $(0, 0)$ is its strict minimizer;

(3) For $\forall \overrightarrow{V} \neq (0, 0)$, $\psi(\overrightarrow{V}s)$ is decreasing over $(-\infty, 0]$ and increasing over $[0, \infty)$;

(4) For $\forall \overrightarrow{V} \neq (0, 0)$, and $\forall s > 0$, $\frac{D\psi}{D\overrightarrow{V}}(\overrightarrow{V}s) = |\overrightarrow{V}|\rho'(|\overrightarrow{V}|s+)$ and $\frac{D\psi}{D(-\overrightarrow{V})}(\overrightarrow{V}s) = -|\overrightarrow{V}|\rho'(|\overrightarrow{V}|s-)$.

A special case of the rotational invariance of $\psi(\cdot, \cdot)$ in the above proposition is its symmetric property such as $\psi(x, y) = \psi(-x, y) = \psi(x, -y) = \psi(-x, -y) = \psi(y, x) = \psi(-y, -x)$.

For convex regularizers, we have some basic properties on their sub-differentials, which will be used later.

Proposition 3.2 *For a convex regularizer $\rho(\cdot)$ satisfying the assumption (AS1), we have*
1. $\varphi(\cdot)$ is convex and

(1) $\forall x$, $\partial\varphi(x)$ is a bounded closed interval;

(2) $g \in \partial\varphi(x) \Longleftrightarrow -g \in \partial\varphi(-x)$*;*

(3) $\partial\varphi(0)$ *is a closed interval centered at the origin;*

(4) $\forall x_1, x_2, x_1 \neq x_2$, $\partial\varphi(x_1) \cap \partial\varphi(x_2)$ *is either empty or their common boundary;*

where $\partial\varphi(x)$ *is the sub-differential of* φ *at* x*.*
2. $\psi(\cdot,\cdot)$ *is convex and*

(1) $\forall (x, y)$, $\partial\psi(x, y)$ *is a bounded closed convex set in the plane* $\mathbb{R}^2$*;*

(2) $(g^1, g^2) \in \partial\psi(x, y) \Longleftrightarrow (g^1, -g^2) \in \partial\psi(x, -y)$*;*
$(g^1, g^2) \in \partial\psi(x, y) \Longleftrightarrow (-g^1, g^2) \in \partial\psi(-x, y)$*;*
$(g^1, g^2) \in \partial\psi(x, y) \Longleftrightarrow (g^2, g^1) \in \partial\psi(y, x)$*;*

(3) $\partial\psi(0, 0)$ *is a closed disk centered at the origin in the plane* $\mathbb{R}^2$*;*

(4) $\forall \tilde{x}, \tilde{y}$ *fixed, the set* $\partial\psi(\tilde{x}, 0)$ *is symmetric with respect to the* x *axis; the set* $\partial\psi(0, \tilde{y})$ *is symmetric with respect to the* y *axis; and the sets* $\partial\psi(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$ *and* $\partial\psi(\tilde{y}, \tilde{x})$ *are mutually symmetric with respect to the line* $y = x$*;*

(5) $\forall (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), (x_1, y_1) \neq (x_2, y_2)$, $\partial\psi(x_1, y_1) \cap \partial\psi(x_2, y_2)$ *is either empty or their common boundary;*

where $\partial\psi(x, y)$ *is the sub-differential of* ψ *at* (x, y)*.*

Proof. The convexity of $\rho(\cdot)$ and the assumption (AS1) indicate that $\rho(\cdot)$ is increasing over $[0, \infty)$.
1. $\varphi(x) = \rho(|x|)$. Since $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex and increasing, and $|x|$ is convex, $\varphi(x)$ is convex. The remainder can be proved by the symmetry of $\varphi(x)$ and monotonicity of its sub-differential.
2. $\psi(x, y) = \rho(\sqrt{x^2 + y^2})$. Since $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex and increasing, and $\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$ is convex, $\psi(x, y)$ is convex. (1) is obvious by the definition of sub-differential. (2)(3)(4) can be checked by the symmetry of $\psi(x, y)$. The monotonicity gives (5) by a reasoning of contradiction. ■

Remark 1 *We mention that, for a convex regularizer* $\rho(\cdot)$ *satisfying the assumption (AS1), the assumptions (AS2)(AS3) hold.*

We introduce the following definitions of the sum of two sets and the product of a set and a real number.

Definition 3.3 *Given two sets* $X_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^d, X_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$*, (*$d \in \mathbf{N}$*), their sum is defined as the set* $X_1 + X_2 = \{x_1 + x_2 : x_1 \in X_1, x_2 \in X_2\}$.

Definition 3.4 *Given a real number* $a \in \mathbb{R}$ *and a set* $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$*, (*$d \in \mathbf{N}$*), their product is defined as the set* $aX = \{ax : x \in X\}$.

The above two definitions induce the difference between two sets.

Definition 3.5 *Given two sets* $X_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^d, X_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$*, (*$d \in \mathbf{N}$*), we define* $X_1 - X_2 = X_1 + (-1)X_2$.

Proposition 3.6 *For any sets* $X_1, X_2, X_3, X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$*:*

(1) $X_1 + X_2 = X_2 + X_1$*;*

(2) $X_1 + X_2 + X_3 = (X_1 + X_2) + X_3$*;*

(3) $-(-X) = X$*;*

(4) If X *is symmetric with respect to the origin, then* $-X = X$*;*

(5) If X is convex, $(a+b)X = aX + bX$, $\forall a \in \mathbb{R}, b \in \mathbb{R}, ab \geq 0$;

(6) If X is convex, $mX = \underbrace{X + X + \cdots + X}_{m}$, $\forall m \in \mathbf{N}$;

(7) If $X_1 \subseteq X_2$, then $X_1 + X_3 \subseteq X_2 + X_3$;

Proof. (1)(2)(3)(4)(7) are obvious by the definition. (6) is a special case of (5). We now establish (5). We only need to consider the nontrivial case with $a \neq 0, b \neq 0$.

Assume $z \in (a+b)X$. Then $z = (a+b)x = ax+bx$ for some $x \in X$. It is clear that $z \in aX+bX$. We thus have $(a+b)X \subseteq aX + bX$.

Conversely, take $z \in aX + bX$. Then $z = ax + by$ for some $x, y \in X$. Hence

$$z = (a+b)\left(\frac{a}{a+b}x + \frac{b}{a+b}y\right) = (a+b)\bar{z}.$$

Since X is convex, $\bar{z} \in X$. This indicates $z \in (a+b)X$. Therefore, $aX + bX \subseteq (a+b)X$. ■

Remark 2

- *When $ab < 0$, (5) in Proposition 3.6 is not true. A counter example is $X = [-1, 1]$ and $a = 1, b = -1$.*
- *When X is not convex, (5) in Proposition 3.6 is not true. A counter example is $X = [-1, -\frac{1}{2}] \cup [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ and $a = 1, b = 1$.*
- *For a convex regularizer $\rho(\cdot)$ satisfying the assumption (AS1), $\partial\varphi(0) = -\partial\varphi(0)$ and $\partial\psi(0,0) = -\partial\psi(0,0)$, by Proposition 3.2.*

We have some more clear representations or estimations on the sub-differentials using the above notations on the product of a real number and a set.

Proposition 3.7 *Assume that a convex regularizer $\rho(\cdot)$ satisfies (AS1).*
1. With $\partial\varphi(a)$ as the sub-differential of φ at a, then

(1) $\partial\varphi(0) = [-\rho\prime(0+), \rho\prime(0+)]$;

(2) $\forall a \neq 0$, $\partial\varphi(a) = \mathrm{sgn}(a)[\rho\prime(|a|-), \rho\prime(|a|+)]$.

2. With $\partial\psi(a,b)$ as the sub-differential of ψ at (a,b), then

(1) $\partial\psi(0,0)$ is a closed disk centered at the origin with radius $\rho\prime(0+)$;

(2) $\forall a \neq 0, \partial\psi(a,0) = \{(g^1, 0) : g^1 \in \mathrm{sgn}(a)[\rho\prime(|a|-), \rho\prime(|a|+)]\}$;

(3) $\forall b \neq 0, \partial\psi(0,b) = \{(0, g^2) : g^2 \in \mathrm{sgn}(b)[\rho\prime(|b|-), \rho\prime(|b|+)]\}$;

(4) $\forall (a,b) \neq (0,0)$, let $(g^1, g^2) \in \partial\psi(a,b)$, then $g^1 \in \frac{a}{\sqrt{a^2+b^2}}[\rho\prime(\sqrt{a^2+b^2}-), \rho\prime(\sqrt{a^2+b^2}+)]$ and $g^2 \in \frac{b}{\sqrt{a^2+b^2}}[\rho\prime(\sqrt{a^2+b^2}-), \rho\prime(\sqrt{a^2+b^2}+)]$.

Proof. According to the symmetry shown in Proposition 3.2, the theorem holds if the representations or estimations are correct for $\partial\varphi(0), \partial\varphi(a), \partial\psi(0,0), \partial\psi(a,0), \partial\psi(a,b)$ with $a > 0, b > 0$.

The results in 1 with $a > 0$ is classical in convex analysis. We now consider 2.

Proposition 3.2 shows that $\partial\psi(0,0)$ is a disk centered at the origin. Actually the radius is $\rho\prime(0+)$ (Note $\rho\prime(0+)$ exists by the convexity of ρ). To see this one just restricts $\psi(x,y)$ at a one-dimensional subspace of the plane and uses the convexity of $\psi(x,y)$ in that subspace.

As for $\partial\psi(a,0)$ with $a>0$, we use the following inequality

$$\psi(x,y)-\psi(a,0)\geq(x-a)g^1+yg^2,\forall(x,y),\forall(g^1,g^2)\in\partial\psi(a,0). \tag{3.1}$$

Taking $x=a$, we get

$$\psi(a,y)-\psi(a,0)\geq yg^2,\forall y,\forall(g^1,g^2)\in\partial\psi(a,0).$$

Since ρ is convex, $\hat{\psi}(y)=\psi(a,y)=\rho(\sqrt{a^2+y^2})$ is convex. It follows that $g^2\in\partial\hat{\psi}(0)$. As $\hat{\psi}\prime(0+)=\hat{\psi}\prime(0-)=0$, we get $g^2=0$. Substituting this into (3.1) and taking $y=0$, we have

$$\psi(x,0)-\psi(a,0)\geq(x-a)g^1,\forall x,\forall(g^1,g^2)\in\partial\psi(a,0).$$

Using the convexity of ρ, one can similarly show $g^1\in[\rho\prime(a-),\rho\prime(a+)]$.

Conversely, taking any $g^1\in[\rho\prime(a-),\rho\prime(a+)]$ and $g^2=0$, we have

$$\psi(x,y)-\psi(a,0)\geq\psi(x,0)-\psi(a,0)\geq(x-a)g^1+yg^2$$

holds for any (x,y). Therefore, $\partial\psi(a,0)=\{(g^1,0):g^1\in[\rho\prime(a-),\rho\prime(a+)]\}$.

Similarly, we can show that, if $(g^1,g^2)\in\partial\psi(a,b)$ with $a,b>0$, then it is necessary that $g^1\in\frac{a}{\sqrt{a^2+b^2}}[\rho\prime(\sqrt{a^2+b^2}-),\rho\prime(\sqrt{a^2+b^2}+)]$ and $g^2\in\frac{b}{\sqrt{a^2+b^2}}[\rho\prime(\sqrt{a^2+b^2}-),\rho\prime(\sqrt{a^2+b^2}+)]$. Note this is not a sufficient condition. ■

Remark 3 *According to the previous definition of the product of a real number and a set, (2)(3) are special cases of (4) in the second part of Proposition 3.7.*

4 The necessity of nonconvex and nonsmooth regularization: 1D

In this section we discuss the necessity of nonconvex and nonsmooth regularization for contrast-preserving restoration in 1D case.

It is well known that edges and contrasts are most important features. For the sake of clarity, we consider the following typical example. Assume that $N=3M$ and the ground truth is

$$\underline{u}_i=\begin{cases}0, & 1\leq i\leq M,\\ \bar{U}, & M+1\leq i\leq 2M,\\ 0, & 2M+1\leq i\leq 3M,\end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

where $\bar{U}$ is a constant. Without loss of generality, we assume $\bar{U}>0$. Obviously, $\underline{u}$ has two edge points and the contrasts are both $\bar{U}$. The observed data $f=A\underline{u}+n\in\mathbb{R}^K$.

We discuss in this section, given $f=A\underline{u}+n$, the possibility of the contrast-preserving restoration of the variational model (2.1). Some results will be proved in more general cases.

4.1 The case without noise

If the observation f is noise free, it seems hopeful to recover $\underline{u}$ precisely, especially when the linear operator $A=I$.

However, the following theorem shows that, with any convex regularizer satisfying the basic assumptions, the variational model (2.1) cannot recover $\underline{u}$ from $f=A\underline{u}$.

Theorem 4.1 *If $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex, then $\underline{u}\notin\arg\min_u E(u)$, i.e., $\underline{u}$ is not the solution of the minimization problem (2.1).*

This theorem is a special case of the following result, whose proof will be given.

Theorem 4.2 *Assume a signal $\tilde{u} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be such that there exists two indices $i_0 \leq i_1$ satisfying*

$$(\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_0-1} > 0 = (\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_0} = \cdots = (\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_1-1} = 0 > (\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_1}, \tag{4.2}$$

or

$$(\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_0-1} < 0 = (\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_0+1} = \cdots = (\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_1-1} = 0 < (\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_1}. \tag{4.3}$$

If $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex, then $\tilde{u} \notin \arg\min_u E(u)$, in which $f = A\tilde{u}$. That is, $\tilde{u}$ cannot be recovered by the minimization problem (2.1) with $f = A\tilde{u}$.

Proof. We only give the proof under the condition (4.2), which is by contradiction.

Since $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex, $\varphi(\cdot)$ is also convex. If $\tilde{u} \in \arg\min_u E(u)$, we have

$$\left(\nabla_x^{\mathsf{T}} \prod_{k=1}^{N} \partial\varphi((\nabla_x \tilde{u})_k) \right)_i + \alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}}(A\tilde{u} - f))_i \ni 0, \ 1 \leq i \leq N,$$

where $\partial\varphi((\nabla_x \tilde{u})_k)$ is the sub-differential of φ at $(\nabla_x \tilde{u})_k$; and T denotes the adjoint operation. As $f = A\tilde{u}$ is noise free, the above condition becomes

$$\partial\varphi((\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i-1}) - \partial\varphi((\nabla_x \tilde{u})_i) \ni 0, \ 1 \leq i \leq N.$$

Consequently, there are sub-gradients $g_i \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_x \tilde{u})_i), 1 \leq i \leq N$ such that

$$g_{i-1} - g_i = 0, \ 1 \leq i \leq N. \tag{4.4}$$

Now look at the index $i = i_0, i_0 + 1, \cdots, i_1 - 1, i_1$. The condition (4.4) gives

$$g_{i_0-1} = g_{i_0} = g_{i_0+1} = \cdots = g_{i_1-1} = g_{i_1}. \tag{4.5}$$

Due to the convexity and (4.2), we assume $\partial\varphi(0) = [l^0, r^0]$, $\partial\varphi((\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_0-1}) = [l^+, r^+]$, $\partial\varphi((\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_1}) = [l^-, r^-]$. Proposition 3.2 shows $l^- \leq r^- \leq l^0 \leq 0 \leq r^0 \leq l^+ \leq r^+$. As $g_{i_0-1} \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_0-1}) = [l^+, r^+]$, $g_{i_0} \in \partial\varphi(0) = [l^0, r^0], \cdots, g_{i_1-1} \in \partial\varphi(0) = [l^0, r^0]$, $g_{i_1} \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_1}) = [l^-, r^-]$, we have $r^- = l^0 = r^0 = l^+ = 0$, from Eqn. (4.5).

Due to the monotonicity, we have

$$0 \in \partial\varphi(x), \forall x \in [0, (\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_0}]. \tag{4.6}$$

This violates that 0 is the strict minimizer of ρ in the assumption (AS1). Therefore, $\tilde{u}$ is not the solution of the minimization problem (2.1). ■

Remark 4

- *The essential requirement of the theorem is the existence of the sign change of the gradient of the signal. The condition (4.2) gives a strict peak with a width $i_1 - i_0 + 1$ of the signal; similarly the condition (4.3) gives a strict valley with a width $i_1 - i_0 + 1$ of the signal.*
- *If $i_0 = i_1$, the condition (4.2) becomes $(\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_0-1} > 0 > (\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_1}$; and the condition (4.3) becomes $(\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_0-1} < 0 < (\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_1}$.*
- *Theorem 4.1 is a special case of Theorem 4.2.*

If ∇_x is with periodic boundary condition, then Theorem 4.2 indicates a stronger result for convex regularizer function $\rho(\cdot)$ as follows. It essentially describes that non-constant signals cannot be recovered by the minimization problem (2.1).

Theorem 4.3 *Assume $\rho(\cdot)$ be convex and ∇_x be with periodic boundary condition. If a signal $\tilde{u} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ can be recovered by the minimization problem (2.1) with $f = A\tilde{u}$, then $\exists c \in \mathbb{R}$, s.t., $\tilde{u} = c(1, 1, \cdots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^N$.*

Proof. We prove it by contradiction. Assume $\tilde{u} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ be such that $\forall c \in \mathbb{R}, \tilde{u} \neq c(1, 1, \cdots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^N$. That is, $\tilde{u}$ is not a constant signal. Then $\tilde{u}$ is either monotonic or satisfies one of the conditions (4.2) (4.3).

If $\tilde{u}$ satisfies (4.2) or (4.3), then Theorem 4.2 indicates that $\tilde{u} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ cannot be recovered by the minimization problem (2.1) with $f = A\tilde{u}$, which is a contradiction.

If $\tilde{u}$ is monotonic. Without loss of generality, we assume $\tilde{u}$ be increasing. Since $\tilde{u}$ is not a constant signal, we have $(\nabla_x \tilde{u})_N < 0$. On the other hand, there exists $i_0 \leq N$ such that $(\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_0-1} > 0 = (\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{i_0} = \cdots = (\nabla_x \tilde{u})_{N-1} = 0 > (\nabla_x \tilde{u})_N$. Again, we use Theorem 4.2 to get a contradiction.

Therefore, $\exists c \in \mathbb{R}, \tilde{u} = c(1, 1, \cdots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^N$. ■

The following theorem holds for both convex and nonconvex regularizers, showing in some sense the contrast reduction effect.

Theorem 4.4 *Assume $\rho'(\bar{U}+) > 0$ and $\rho'(\bar{U}-) > 0$. Then*

(1) Any u with higher contrast than $\underline{u}$ satisfies $E(u) > E(\underline{u})$;

(2) There always exists u with lower contrast than $\underline{u}$ satisfying $E(u) < E(\underline{u})$.

Proof. We prove the theorem by contradiction.
(1) If there exists a $\hat{u} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with higher contrast than $\underline{u}$ satisfying $E(\hat{u}) \leq E(\underline{u})$, then $|\hat{u}_{M+1} - \hat{u}_M| \geq \bar{U}, |\hat{u}_{2M+1} - \hat{u}_{2M}| \geq \bar{U}$ with at least one strict inequality, and the following holds

$$0 \geq E(\hat{u}) - E(\underline{u}) \geq \rho(|\hat{u}_{M+1} - \hat{u}_M|) + \rho(|\hat{u}_{2M+1} - \hat{u}_{2M}|) - 2\rho(\bar{U}) \geq 0,$$

due to the monotonicity of ρ. It is necessary that $\rho(|\hat{u}_{M+1} - \hat{u}_M|) = \rho(|\hat{u}_{2M+1} - \hat{u}_{2M}|) = \rho(\bar{U})$. Since either $|\hat{u}_{M+1} - \hat{u}_M| > \bar{U}$ or $|\hat{u}_{2M+1} - \hat{u}_{2M}| > \bar{U}$, it follows that $\rho'(\bar{U}+) = 0$. This is a contradiction.
(2) Let us define $u^\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^N$ as following

$$u_i^\epsilon = \begin{cases} \epsilon, & 1 \leq i \leq M, \\ \bar{U} - \epsilon, & M+1 \leq i \leq 2M, \\ \epsilon, & 2M+1 \leq i \leq 3M, \end{cases}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is a small positive number. Obviously u^ϵ has lower contrast than $\underline{u}$. Now we show that there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ satisfying $E(u^\epsilon) < E(\underline{u})$. Assume that $E(u^\epsilon) \geq E(\underline{u}), \forall \epsilon > 0$. That is,

$$2\rho\left(\bar{U} - 2\epsilon\right) - 2\rho\left(\bar{U}\right) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|A(\underline{u} - \epsilon \mathbf{1}_{\text{mid}} + \epsilon(\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1}_{\text{mid}})) - f\|_{\mathbb{R}^K}^2 \geq 0, \ \forall \epsilon > 0,$$

where $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \cdots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $\mathbf{1}_{\text{mid}} = (\underbrace{0, \cdots, 0}_{M}, \underbrace{1, \cdots, 1}_{M}, \underbrace{0, \cdots, 0}_{M}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$. It follows that

$$2\rho\left(\bar{U} - 2\epsilon\right) - 2\rho\left(\bar{U}\right) + \epsilon^2 \frac{\alpha}{2}\|A(-\mathbf{1}_{\text{mid}} + (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1}_{\text{mid}}))\|_{\mathbb{R}^K}^2 \geq 0, \ \forall \epsilon > 0.$$

Letting $\epsilon \to 0$, we get

$$\rho'\left(\bar{U}-\right) \leq 0,$$

which is a contradiction. ■

Remark 5 *We mention that, by monotonicity, we always have $\rho'(\bar{U}+) > 0$ and $\rho'(\bar{U}-) > 0$ for a convex $\rho(\cdot)$ satisfying (AS1).*

4.2 The case with noise

When f is contaminated with random noise, it is hard to expect (2.1) to always perfectly recover $\underline{u}$. We have some results on the probability of the perfect recovery.

Theorem 4.5 *For the typical $\underline{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{3M}$ defined in Eqn. (4.1) and its noisy observation $f = A\underline{u} + n$. Assume $\varphi(\cdot) \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$. Then $\mathcal{P}(\underline{u} \in \arg\min_u E(u)) = 0$, in which $f = A\underline{u} + n$.*

This result is a special case of the following theorem, whose proof will be given.

Theorem 4.6 *For a general signal $\tilde{u} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and its noisy observation $f = A\tilde{u} + n$. Assume $\varphi(\cdot) \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$. Then $\mathcal{P}(\tilde{u} \in \arg\min_u E(u)) = 0$, in which $f = A\tilde{u} + n$.*

Proof. If $\varphi(\cdot) \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$, then $E(\cdot)$ is also C^1. For $\tilde{u} \in \arg\min_u E(u)$, in which $f = A\tilde{u} + n$, the first order necessary condition is:

$$D_i E(\tilde{u}) = \left(\varphi'\left(\tilde{u}_i - \tilde{u}_{i-1}\right) - \varphi'\left(\tilde{u}_{i+1} - \tilde{u}_i\right)\right) + \alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}}(A\tilde{u} - f))_i = 0, \quad 1 \le i \le N, \tag{4.7}$$

where D_i is the partial derivative with respect to u_i.

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{P}(\tilde{u} \in \arg\min_u E(u)) \\
\le\ &\mathcal{P}\left(D_i E(\tilde{u}) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, N\right) \\
\le\ &\mathcal{P}\left(D_2 E(\tilde{u}) = 0\right) \\
=\ &\mathcal{P}\left(\varphi'\left(\tilde{u}_2 - \tilde{u}_1\right) - \varphi'\left(\tilde{u}_3 - \tilde{u}_2\right) + \alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}}(A\tilde{u} - f))_2 = 0\right) \\
=\ &\mathcal{P}\left((A^{\mathsf{T}}n)_2 = \frac{1}{\alpha}\left(\varphi'\left(\tilde{u}_2 - \tilde{u}_1\right) - \varphi'\left(\tilde{u}_3 - \tilde{u}_2\right)\right)\right) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Knowing that probability is nonnegative, we proved the theorem. ■

The above theorem shows that, the minimization problem (2.1), with differentiable regularizers, is impossible to recover $\tilde{u}$ from noisy measurements.

Now let us check what will happen by using convex regularizers.

Theorem 4.7 *Suppose that $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex. Let $l^0 = -\rho\prime(0+), r^0 = \rho\prime(0+); l^1 = \rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right), r^1 = \rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)$. Denote*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_M &= \Phi\left(\frac{r^0 - l^1}{\alpha\sigma|a_M|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{l^0 - r^1}{\alpha\sigma|a_M|_2}\right); \\
\mathcal{P}_{M+1} &= \Phi\left(\frac{r^1 - l^0}{\alpha\sigma|a_{M+1}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{l^1 - r^0}{\alpha\sigma|a_{M+1}|_2}\right); \\
\mathcal{P}_{2M} &= \Phi\left(\frac{r^0 + r^1}{\alpha\sigma|a_{2M}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{l^0 + l^1}{\alpha\sigma|a_{2M}|_2}\right); \\
\mathcal{P}_{2M+1} &= \Phi\left(\frac{-l^0 - l^1}{\alpha\sigma|a_{2M+1}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{-r^0 - r^1}{\alpha\sigma|a_{2M+1}|_2}\right); \\
\mathcal{P}_i &= \Phi\left(\frac{r^0 - l^0}{\alpha\sigma|a_i|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{l^0 - r^0}{\alpha\sigma|a_i|_2}\right), i \ne M, M+1, 2M, 2M+1,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

with $\Phi(\cdot)$ as the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution; and a_i as the i'th column of A. Then we have

(1) $\mathcal{P}(\underline{u} \in \arg\min_u E(u)) \le \min\{\mathcal{P}_i, i = 1, \cdots, 3M\}$;

(2) If $A = I$ (denoising problem), $\mathcal{P}(\underline{u} \in \arg\min_u E(u)) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{3M} \mathcal{P}_i$ with $|a_i|_2 = 1, \forall i$.

Proof. Since $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex, $\varphi(\cdot)$ is convex. Assume $\underline{u} \in \arg\min_u E(u)$. It is necessary that

$$\left(\nabla_x^{\mathsf{T}} \prod_{k=1}^{3M} \partial\varphi((\nabla_x \underline{u})_k)\right)_i + \alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}}(A\underline{u} - f))_i \ni 0,\ 1 \leq i \leq 3M,$$

where $\partial\varphi((\nabla_x \underline{u})_k)$ is the sub-differential of φ at $(\nabla_x \underline{u})_k$; and T denotes the adjoint operation. Denote the sub-gradients in $\partial\varphi((\nabla_x \underline{u})_k)$ as g_k, $k = 1, \cdots, 3M$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{P}(\underline{u} \in \arg\min_u E(u)) \\
&= \mathcal{P}(\exists g_i \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_x \underline{u})_i), 1 \leq i \leq 3M, \text{s.t.}, g_{i-1} - g_i = \alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}} n)_i, 1 \leq i \leq 3M) \\
&\leq \mathcal{P}(\forall 1 \leq i \leq 3M, \exists g_i \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_x \underline{u})_i), g_{i-1} \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_x \underline{u})_{i-1}), \text{s.t.}, g_{i-1} - g_i = \alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}} n)_i)
\end{aligned}$$

due to the randomness of n.

If we introduce, for each $i, 1 \leq i \leq 3M$, the random event $\mathcal{E}_i$ as

$$\partial\varphi((\nabla_x \underline{u})_{i-1}) - \partial\varphi((\nabla_x \underline{u})_i) \ni \alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}} n)_i,\ 1 \leq i \leq 3M, \tag{4.9}$$

it then follows that

$$\mathcal{P}(\underline{u} \in \arg\min_u E(u)) \leq \mathcal{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{3M} \mathcal{E}_i\right). \tag{4.10}$$

Using the structure of $\underline{u}$, the random events $\mathcal{E}_i, 1 \leq i \leq 3M$ can be computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_i &= \{\partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi(0) \ni \alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}} n)_i\}, i \neq M, M+1, 2M, 2M+1; \\
\mathcal{E}_M &= \{\partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right) \ni \alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}} n)_M\}; \\
\mathcal{E}_{M+1} &= \{\partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right) - \partial\varphi(0) \ni \alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}} n)_{M+1}\}; \\
\mathcal{E}_{2M} &= \{\partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi\left(-\bar{U}\right) \ni \alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}} n)_{2M}\}; \\
\mathcal{E}_{2M+1} &= \{\partial\varphi\left(-\bar{U}\right) - \partial\varphi(0) \ni \alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}} n)_{2M+1}\},
\end{aligned}$$

which can be further written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_i &= \{\alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}} n)_i \in [l^0 - r^0, r^0 - l^0]\}, i \neq M, M+1, 2M, 2M+1; \\
\mathcal{E}_M &= \{\alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}} n)_M \in [l^0 - r^1, r^0 - l^1]\}; \\
\mathcal{E}_{M+1} &= \{\alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}} n)_{M+1} \in [l^1 - r^0, r^1 - l^0]\}; \\
\mathcal{E}_{2M} &= \{\alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}} n)_{2M} \in [l^0 + l^1, r^0 + r^1]\}; \\
\mathcal{E}_{2M+1} &= \{\alpha(A^{\mathsf{T}} n)_{2M+1} \in [-r^0 - r^1, -l^0 - l^1]\},
\end{aligned}$$

by the fact $\partial\varphi(0) = [l^0, r^0], \partial\varphi(\bar{U}) = [l^1, r^1]$ and $\partial\varphi(-\bar{U}) = -\partial\varphi(\bar{U})$.

Since $n_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2), 1 \leq j \leq N$ are i.i.d, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_i &= \Phi\left(\frac{r^0 - l^0}{\alpha\sigma|a_i|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{l^0 - r^0}{\alpha\sigma|a_i|_2}\right), i \neq M, M+1, 2M, 2M+1; \\
\mathcal{P}_M &= \Phi\left(\frac{r^0 - l^1}{\alpha\sigma|a_M|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{l^0 - r^1}{\alpha\sigma|a_M|_2}\right); \\
\mathcal{P}_{M+1} &= \Phi\left(\frac{r^1 - l^0}{\alpha\sigma|a_{M+1}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{l^1 - r^0}{\alpha\sigma|a_{M+1}|_2}\right); \\
\mathcal{P}_{2M} &= \Phi\left(\frac{r^0 + r^1}{\alpha\sigma|a_{2M}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{l^0 + l^1}{\alpha\sigma|a_{2M}|_2}\right);
\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{2M+1} = \Phi\left(\frac{-l^0 - l^1}{\alpha\sigma|a_{2M+1}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{-r^0 - r^1}{\alpha\sigma|a_{2M+1}|_2}\right),$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution; and a_i is the i'th column of A.

Therefore, Eqn. (4.10) gives

$$\mathcal{P}(\underline{u} \in \arg\min_u E(u)) \leq \min\{\mathcal{P}_i, i = 1, \cdots, 3M\},$$

which is exactly (1). If $A = I$ (i.e., denoising problem), then the random events $\mathcal{E}_i$ defined in (4.9) are independent. Therefore (2) holds. ■

The above proof actually indicates the following result, where the signal is a general one.

Theorem 4.8 *For a general signal $\tilde{u} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and its noisy observation $f = A\tilde{u} + n$. Suppose that $\varphi(\cdot)$ is convex. For $i = 1, \cdots, N$, denote*

$$\mathcal{Q}_i = \Phi\left(\frac{\sup\{g : g \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_x\tilde{u})_{i-1}) - \partial\varphi((\nabla_x\tilde{u})_i)\}}{\alpha\sigma|a_i|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{\inf\{g : g \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_x\tilde{u})_{i-1}) - \partial\varphi((\nabla_x\tilde{u})_i)\}}{\alpha\sigma|a_i|_2}\right),$$

with $\Phi(\cdot)$ as the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution; and a_i as the i'th column of A. Then we have

(1) $\mathcal{P}(\tilde{u} \in \arg\min_u E(u)) \leq \min\{\mathcal{Q}_i, i = 1, \cdots, N\}$;

(2) If $A = I$ (denoising problem), $\mathcal{P}(\tilde{u} \in \arg\min_u E(u)) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{Q}_i$ with $|a_i|_2 = 1, \forall i$.

Remark 6 *Some facts can be seen from Theorem 4.7.*

- *$\mathcal{P}_M \leq \frac{1}{2}, \mathcal{P}_{M+1} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \mathcal{P}_{2M} \leq \frac{1}{2}, \mathcal{P}_{2M+1} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. The whole probability to recover the ground truth is at most $\frac{1}{2}$. In denoising problems where $A = I$, the whole probability is even lower, since $\mathcal{P}(\underline{u} \in \arg\min_u E(u)) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{3M} \mathcal{P}_i$ with $|a_i|_2 = 1, \forall i$. For large M, it approaches 0.*
- *To get higher probability, it is necessary to maximize the probabilities in Eq. (4.8). It is better to choose a regularizer with as large $r^0 - l^0, r^1 - l^0, r^0 + r^1, r^0 - l^1$ as possible. This 'requires' in some sense the non-differentiability of $\varphi(\cdot)$ at $0, \bar{U}$ and differentiability in $(0, \bar{U})$.*
- *For piecewise constant signals, there are more samples in flat regions than discontinuities. Therefore, it is more important to 'require' $r^0 - l^0$ as large as possible.*

5 The necessity of nonconvex and nonsmooth regularization: 2D

In this section we discuss the necessity of nonconvex and nonsmooth regularization for contrast-preserving restoration in 2D case.

For the sake of clarity, let us consider the following typical example. Assume that $N = 3M$ and the ground truth is $\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$

$$\underline{\mathbf{u}}_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \bar{U}, & M+1 \leq i, j \leq 2M, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

where $\bar{U}$ is a constant (the contrast). Without loss of generality, we assume $\bar{U} > 0$. Obviously, $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ has edge points with contrast $\bar{U}$. The observed data $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{A}\underline{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{R}^{K\times K}$.

Given $\mathbf{f}$, we discuss the possibility of the contrast-preserving restoration of the variational models (2.2) and (2.3). Some results will be proved in more general cases.

5.1 The case without noise

If the observation $\mathbf{f}$ is noise free, it seems hopeful to recover $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ precisely, especially when the linear operator $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}$.

However, the following theorems show that, with any convex regularizer satisfying the basic assumptions, the variational models (2.2) and (2.3) cannot recover $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ from $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{A}\underline{\mathbf{u}}$.

Theorem 5.1 *If $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex, then $\underline{\mathbf{u}} \notin \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\mathrm{ani}}(\mathbf{u})$, i.e., $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ is not the solution of the minimization problem (2.2).*

This result is a special case of the following theorem, whose proof will be given.

Theorem 5.2 *Assume an image $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$ be such that there exist indices $i_0 < i_1$ and j_0 satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} &(\nabla_y \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j_0-1} \geq (\nabla_y \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j_0},\ i_0 \leq i \leq i_1, \\ &(\nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i_0-1,j_0} > 0 = (\nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i_0,j_0} = \cdots = (\nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i_1-1,j_0} = 0 > (\nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i_1,j_0}; \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} &(\nabla_y \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j_0-1} \leq (\nabla_y \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j_0},\ i_0 \leq i \leq i_1, \\ &(\nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i_0-1,j_0} < 0 = (\nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i_0,j_0} = \cdots = (\nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i_1-1,j_0} = 0 < (\nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i_1,j_0}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

If $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex, then $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \notin \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\mathrm{ani}}(\mathbf{u})$, in which $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$. That is, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ cannot be recovered by the minimization problem (2.2) with $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$.

Proof. We only give the proof under the condition (5.2), which is by contradiction.

Since $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex, $\varphi(\cdot)$ is convex. If $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\mathrm{ani}}(\mathbf{u})$, then

$$\left(\nabla^{\mathsf{T}} \prod_{k,l=1}^{3M} (\partial\varphi((\nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l}) \times \partial\varphi((\nabla_y \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l}))\right)_{i,j} + \alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{f}))_{i,j} \ni 0, 1 \leq i,j \leq N,$$

where $\partial\varphi((\nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l})$ is the sub-differential of φ at $(\nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l}$; and $\nabla = (\nabla_x, \nabla_y)$. As $\mathbf{f}$ is noise free, the above condition becomes

$$\left(\nabla^{\mathsf{T}} \prod_{k,l=1}^{N} (\partial\varphi((\nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l}) \times \partial\varphi((\nabla_y \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l}))\right)_{i,j} \ni 0, 1 \leq i,j \leq N.$$

Consequently there exist sub-gradients $g^1_{k,l} \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l})$ and $g^2_{k,l} \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_y \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l})$, $k,l = 1,\cdots,N$, such that

$$g^1_{i-1,j} - g^1_{i,j} + g^2_{i,j-1} - g^2_{i,j} = 0, 1 \leq i,j \leq N. \tag{5.4}$$

Now look at the index $(i,j) = (i_0,j_0),(i_0+1,j_0),\cdots,(i_1,j_0)$. From (5.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &g^1_{i_0-1,j_0} - g^1_{i_0,j_0} + g^2_{i_0,j_0-1} - g^2_{i_0,j_0} = 0, \\ &\cdots, \\ &g^1_{i-1,j_0} - g^1_{i,j_0} + g^2_{i,j_0-1} - g^2_{i,j_0} = 0, \\ &\cdots, \\ &g^1_{i_1-1,j_0} - g^1_{i_1,j_0} + g^2_{i_1,j_0-1} - g^2_{i_1,j_0} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

We now assume $\partial\varphi(0) = [l^0, r^0], \partial\varphi((\nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i_0-1,j_0}) = [l^+, r^+], \partial\varphi((\nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i_1,j_0}) = [l^-, r^-]$. Proposition 3.2 shows $l^- \leq r^- \leq l^0 \leq 0 \leq r^0 \leq l^+ \leq r^+$. Note that the first equation in the condition

(5.2) gives the monotonicity of the sub-differentials. Therefore the condition (5.2) and the first equation in (5.5) gives

$$g^1_{i_0,j_0} = g^1_{i_0-1,j_0} = r^0 = l^+.$$

This equality, together with the condition (5.2) and (5.5), indicates that

$$g^1_{i,j_0} = r^0 = l^+, \forall i_0 \le i \le i_1 - 1,$$

by recursion. It then follows from the last equation in (5.5) that

$$l^+ = r^0 = l^0 = r^- = 0.$$

Due to the monotonicity of the sub-differential, it then follows that

$$\{0\} = \partial\varphi(s), \forall s \in [0, (\nabla_x \tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i_0-1,j_0}]. \tag{5.6}$$

This violates that 0 is the strict minimizer of ρ in the assumption (AS1). Therefore, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ is not the solution of the minimization problem (2.2) with $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$. ■

Remark 7

- *The essential requirement of the theorem is the existence of the sign change of one component and the monotonicity of the other component of the image gradient. The condition (5.2) gives a strict peak with a width $i_1 - i_0 + 1$ in the image parallel to the x axis; similarly the condition (5.3) gives a strict valley with a width $i_1 - i_0 + 1$ in the image parallel to the x axis.*
- *The peak given in (5.2) (valley in (5.3)) are horizontal. According to the symmetry, the theorem holds under one of the other similar 6 conditions (two horizontal and four verticals), which are either strict peaks or strict valleys.*
- *Theorem 5.1 is a special case of Theorem 5.2 with a special case of the condition (5.2).*

Theorem 5.3 *If $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex, then $\underline{\mathbf{u}} \notin \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u})$, i.e., $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ is not the solution of the minimization problem (2.3).*

Proof. We prove the result by contradiction. Since $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex, $\psi(\cdot,\cdot)$ is convex. If $\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u})$, we have

$$\left(\nabla^{\mathsf{T}} \prod_{k,l=1}^{3M} \partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l})\right)_{i,j} + \alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}(\mathbf{A}\underline{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{f}))_{i,j} \ni 0, \quad 1 \le i,j \le 3M,$$

where $\partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l})$ is the sub-differential of ψ at $(\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l}$. Since $\mathbf{f}$ is noise free, it follows that

$$\left(\nabla^{\mathsf{T}} \prod_{k,l=1}^{3M} \partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l})\right)_{i,j} \ni 0, \quad 1 \le i,j \le 3M.$$

Thus there exist sub-gradients $\mathbf{g}_{k,l} = (g^1_{k,l}, g^2_{k,l}) \in \partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l}), k,l = 1,\cdots,3M$, such that

$$g^1_{i-1,j} - g^1_{i,j} + g^2_{i,j-1} - g^2_{i,j} = 0, 1 \le i,j \le 3M. \tag{5.7}$$

Now look at the index $(i.j) = (M+1, M+1)$. It follows from (5.7) that

$$g^1_{M,M+1} - g^1_{M+1,M+1} + g^2_{M+1,M} - g^2_{M+1,M+1} = 0. \tag{5.8}$$

On the other hand, $\mathbf{g}_{M,M+1} = (g^1_{M,M+1}, g^2_{M,M+1}) \in \partial\psi\left(\bar{U}, 0\right)$, $\mathbf{g}_{M+1,M} = (g^1_{M+1,M}, g^2_{M+1,M}) \in \partial\psi\left(0, \bar{U}\right)$, $\mathbf{g}_{M+1,M+1} = (g^1_{M+1,M+1}, g^2_{M+1,M+1}) \in \partial\psi(0,0)$. According to Proposition 3.2, we

assume $\partial\psi(0,0) = C((0,0), r)$ with the radius $r \geq 0$. Using the monotonicity of sub-differential, we deduce from (5.8)

$$g^1_{M,M+1} = g^1_{M+1,M+1} = r, g^2_{M+1,M} = g^2_{M+1,M+1} = r.$$

This means that $(g^1_{M+1,M+1}, g^2_{M+1,M+1}) = (r, r) \in \partial\psi(0,0)$. Therefore $r = 0$.

It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{g} = (g^1, g^2) \in \partial\psi(s,0), g^1 = 0, \forall s \in [0, \bar{U}), \\ &\mathbf{g} = (g^1, g^2) \in \partial\psi(0,s), g^2 = 0, \forall s \in [0, \bar{U}). \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

Take an $s \in (0, \bar{U})$. The above equation shows that

$$\psi(0,0) - \psi(0,s) \geq \partial\psi(0,s) \cdot (0, -s) = 0,$$

which violates the assumption (AS1). Therefore, $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ is not the solution of the minimization problem (2.3). ■

This theorem can be extended to a more general result as follows.

Theorem 5.4 *Assume $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex. Given an image $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$. Assume there exist indices $1 < i_0, j_0 < N$ with $(\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i_0,j_0}, (\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i_0-1,j_0}, (\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i_0,j_0-1}$ denoted respectively as $(a_0, b_0), (a_x, b_x), (a_y, b_y)$, such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall (g^1_{i_0,j_0}, g^2_{i_0,j_0}) \in \partial\psi(a_0, b_0), (g^1_{i_0-1,j_0}, g^2_{i_0-1,j_0}) \in \partial\psi(a_x, b_x), (g^1_{i_0,j_0-1}, g^2_{i_0,j_0-1}) \in \partial\psi(a_y, b_y), \\ &g^1_{i_0-1,j_0} - g^1_{i_0,j_0} + g^2_{i_0,j_0-1} - g^2_{i_0,j_0} \neq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

Then $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \notin \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u})$, in which $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$. That is, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ cannot be recovered by the minimization problem (2.3) with $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$. A sufficient condition for (5.10) is

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \notin\ & \frac{a_x}{\sqrt{a_x^2 + b_x^2}}[\rho\prime(\sqrt{a_x^2 + b_x^2}-), \rho\prime(\sqrt{a_x^2 + b_x^2}+)] - \frac{a_0}{\sqrt{a_0^2 + b_0^2}}[\rho\prime(\sqrt{a_0^2 + b_0^2}-), \rho\prime(\sqrt{a_0^2 + b_0^2}+)] \\ &+ \frac{b_y}{\sqrt{a_y^2 + b_y^2}}[\rho\prime(\sqrt{a_y^2 + b_y^2}-), \rho\prime(\sqrt{a_y^2 + b_y^2}+)] - \frac{b_0}{\sqrt{a_0^2 + b_0^2}}[\rho\prime(\sqrt{a_0^2 + b_0^2}-), \rho\prime(\sqrt{a_0^2 + b_0^2}+)]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

Proof. The proof is a general case of that of Theorem 5.3. Since $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex, $\psi(\cdot,\cdot)$ is convex. If $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u})$, we have

$$\left(\nabla^{\mathsf{T}} \prod_{k,l=1}^{N} \partial\psi((\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l})\right)_{i,j} + \alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{f}))_{i,j} \ni 0, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq N,$$

where $\partial\psi((\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l})$ is the sub-differential of ψ at $(\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l}$. Since $\mathbf{f}$ is noise free, there exist sub-gradients $\mathbf{g}_{k,l} = (g^1_{k,l}, g^2_{k,l}) \in \partial\psi((\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l}), k, l = 1, \cdots, N$, such that

$$g^1_{i-1,j} - g^1_{i,j} + g^2_{i,j-1} - g^2_{i,j} = 0, 1 \leq i, j \leq N. \tag{5.12}$$

This condition at the index $(i.j) = (i_0.j_0)$ is

$$g^1_{i_0-1,j_0} - g^1_{i_0,j_0} + g^2_{i_0,j_0-1} - g^2_{i_0,j_0} = 0, \tag{5.13}$$

which violates the assumption of this theorem. Therefore, $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ is not the solution of the minimization problem (2.3) with $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$.

Using Proposition 3.7 and (7) of Proposition 3.6, it is clear that the condition (5.11) is sufficient to the condition (5.10). ■

Remark 8

- *The assumption of the above theorem essentially talks about the positions of the sub-differentials of the image gradient at three neighboring pixels. If the positions of the three sub-differentials are separated properly by the $x-$ axis and $y-$ axis, the assumption holds. For instance, when $a_0 < 0, b_0 < 0, a_x > 0, b_y > 0$, the assumption holds. This means the sign change of the finite difference of the image intensity at the $x-$ axis and $y-$ axis.*
- *The condition (5.10) is quite general. Therefore, to check it is sometimes not trivial; see, e.g., the case of Theorem 5.3.*
- *Theorem 5.3 is a special case of Theorem 5.4.*

The following two theorems hold for both convex and nonconvex regularizers.

Theorem 5.5 *Assume $\rho'(\bar{U}+) > 0$ and $\rho'(\bar{U}-) > 0$. Then*

(1) Any $\mathbf{u}$ with higher contrast than $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ satisfies $E_{\text{ani}}(\mathbf{u}) > E_{\text{ani}}(\underline{\mathbf{u}})$;

(2) There always exists $\mathbf{u}$ with lower contrast than $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ satisfying $E_{\text{ani}}(\mathbf{u}) < E_{\text{ani}}(\underline{\mathbf{u}})$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 4.4, which is by contradiction. ■

Theorem 5.6 *Assume $\rho'(\bar{U}+) > 0, \rho'(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}+) > 0$ and $\rho'(\bar{U}-) + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4M-2}\rho'(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}-) > 0$. Then*

(1) Any $\mathbf{u}$ with higher contrast than $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ satisfies $E_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u}) > E_{\text{iso}}(\underline{\mathbf{u}})$;

(2) There always exists $\mathbf{u}$ with lower contrast than $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ satisfying $E_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u}) < E_{\text{iso}}(\underline{\mathbf{u}})$.

Proof. Although the basic idea is similar to that of Theorem 4.4, we give the sketches due to the differences in dimension and the isotropy. We first calculate that

$$E_{\text{iso}}(\underline{\mathbf{u}}) = (4M-2)\rho\left(\bar{U}\right) + \rho\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}\right).$$

The set $\{(i,j) : |(\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}| \neq 0\}$ is denoted as J_1 here. It is clear that $J_1 = \{(i,j) : |(\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}| = \bar{U} \text{ or } \sqrt{2}\bar{U}\}$.
(1) If there exists $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ with higher contrast than $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$ satisfies $E_{\text{iso}}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) \leq E_{\text{iso}}(\underline{\mathbf{u}})$, then

$$|(\nabla\hat{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}| \geq |(\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}|, \forall (i,j) \in J_1,$$

with at least one inequality, and

$$0 \geq E_{\text{iso}}(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) - E_{\text{iso}}(\underline{\mathbf{u}}) \geq \sum_{(i,j)\in J_1} \rho(|(\nabla\hat{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}|) - (4M-2)\rho\left(\bar{U}\right) - \rho\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}\right) \geq 0,$$

by the monotonicity of ρ. The latter indicates that

$$\rho(|(\nabla\hat{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}|) = \rho(|(\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}|), \forall (i,j) \in J_1.$$

Without loss of generality, now let $|(\nabla\hat{\mathbf{u}})_{i_1,j_1}| \geq |(\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i_1,j_1}|$, $(i_1,j_1) \in J_1$. It then follows either $|(\nabla\hat{\mathbf{u}})_{i_1,j_1}| > \bar{U} = |(\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i_1,j_1}|$ or $|(\nabla\hat{\mathbf{u}})_{i_1,j_1}| > \sqrt{2}\bar{U} = |(\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i_1,j_1}|$. This leads to either $\rho'(\bar{U}+) = 0$ or $\rho'(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}+) = 0$, which is a contradiction.
(2) Let us define $\mathbf{u}^\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^N$ as following

$$\mathbf{u}^\epsilon_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \bar{U} - \epsilon, & M+1 \leq i,j \leq 2M, \\ \epsilon, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is a small positive number. Obviously $\mathbf{u}^\epsilon$ has lower contrast than $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$.

It is then calculated that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\rm iso}(\mathbf{u}^\epsilon) &= (4M-2)\rho\left(\bar{U}-2\epsilon\right)+\rho\left(\sqrt{2}(\bar{U}-2\epsilon)\right)+\frac{\alpha}{2}\|\mathbf{A}(\underline{\mathbf{u}}-\epsilon\mathbf{1}_{\rm mid}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{1}_{\rm mid}+\epsilon(\mathbf{1}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{1}-\mathbf{1}_{\rm mid}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{1}_{\rm mid}))-\mathbf{f}\|^2 \\ &= (4M-2)\rho\left(\bar{U}-2\epsilon\right)+\rho\left(\sqrt{2}(\bar{U}-2\epsilon)\right)+\frac{\alpha}{2}\epsilon^2\|\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{1}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{1}-2\cdot\mathbf{1}_{\rm mid}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{1}_{\rm mid})\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{1}=(1,1,\cdots,1)\in\mathbb{R}^{3M}$, $\mathbf{1}_{\rm mid}=(\underbrace{0,\cdots,0}_{M},\underbrace{1,\cdots,1}_{M},\underbrace{0,\cdots,0}_{M})\in\mathbb{R}^{3M}$. The remainder of the proof is then similar to that of Theorem 4.4. ■

Remark 9 *We mention that, by monotonicity, we always have* $\rho'\left(\bar{U}-\right)>0, \rho'(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}-)>0$ *for convex* $\rho(\cdot)$ *satisfying (AS1).*

5.2 The case with noise

When $\mathbf{f}$ is contaminated with random noise, it is hard to expect (2.2) and (2.3) to always perfectly recover $\underline{\mathbf{u}}$. Actually, we can show that the probability of the perfect recovery is very low.

Theorem 5.7

(1) Suppose $\varphi(\cdot)\in C^1(\mathbb{R})$. *Then* $\mathcal{P}(\underline{\mathbf{u}}\in\arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\rm ani}(\mathbf{u}))=0$.

(2) Suppose $\psi(\cdot,\cdot)\in C^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$. *Then* $\mathcal{P}(\underline{\mathbf{u}}\in\arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\rm iso}(\mathbf{u}))=0$.

This result is a special case of the following theorem, whose proof will be given.

Theorem 5.8 *For a general image* $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\in\mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$ *and its noisy degradation* $\mathbf{f}=\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}+\mathbf{n}$.

(1) Suppose $\varphi(\cdot)\in C^1(\mathbb{R})$. *Then* $\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\in\arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\rm ani}(\mathbf{u}))=0$, *where* $\mathbf{f}=\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}+\mathbf{n}$.

(2) Suppose $\psi(\cdot,\cdot)\in C^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$. *Then* $\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\in\arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\rm iso}(\mathbf{u}))=0$, *where* $\mathbf{f}=\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}+\mathbf{n}$.

Proof. (1) If $\varphi(\cdot)\in C^1(\mathbb{R})$, then $E_{\rm ani}(\cdot)$ is also C^1. For $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\in\arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\rm ani}(\mathbf{u})$, the first order necessary condition is:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{i,j}E_{\rm ani}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) = {}& \varphi'((\nabla_x\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i-1,j})-\varphi'((\nabla_x\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j})+\varphi'((\nabla_y\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j-1})-\varphi'((\nabla_y\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}) \\ & +\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}-\mathbf{f}))_{i,j}=0,\quad 1\le i,j\le N, \end{aligned}$$

where $D_{i,j}$ denote the partial derivative with respect to $\mathbf{u}_{i,j}$. The remainder of the proof is then similar to that of Theorem 4.6.

(2) If $\psi(\cdot,\cdot)\in C^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, then $E_{\rm iso}(\cdot)$ is also C^1. For $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}\in\arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\rm iso}(\mathbf{u})$, the first order necessary condition is:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{i,j}E_{\rm iso}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) = {}& \psi_1'((\nabla_x\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i-1,j},(\nabla_y\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i-1,j})-\psi_1'((\nabla_x\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j},(\nabla_y\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}) \\ & +\psi_2'((\nabla_x\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j-1},(\nabla_y\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j-1})-\psi_2'((\nabla_x\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j},(\nabla_y\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}) \\ & +\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}(\mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{u}}-\mathbf{f}))_{i,j}=0,\quad 1\le i,j\le N, \end{aligned}$$

where $D_{i,j}$ denote the partial derivative with respect to $\mathbf{u}_{i,j}$; and ψ_1',ψ_2' are partial derivatives of ψ. The remainder of the proof is then similar to that of Theorem 4.6. ■

To establish the following theorems, we give a notation. By the linearity of $\mathbf{A}$, we denote $(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,j}=\mathbf{a}_{i,j}\cdot\mathbf{n}, 1\le i,j\le N$, where $\cdot$ is the inner product of $\mathbb{R}^{K\times K}$.

Theorem 5.9 *Suppose $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex. Let $l^0 = -\rho\prime(0+), r^0 = \rho\prime(0+); l^1 = \rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right), r^1 = \rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)$. Let* $\mathrm{OT} = \{(i,M) : M+1 \le i \le 2M\}$, $\mathrm{OL} = \{(M,j) : M+1 \le j \le 2M\}$, $\mathrm{OB} = \{(i,2M+1) : M+1 \le i \le 2M\}$, $\mathrm{OR} = \{(2M+1,j) : M+1 \le j \le 2M\}$; $\mathrm{IT} = \{(i,M+1) : M+2 \le i \le 2M-1\}$, $\mathrm{IL} = \{(M+1,j) : M+2 \le j \le 2M-1\}$, $\mathrm{IB} = \{(i,2M) : M+2 \le i \le 2M-1\}$, $\mathrm{IR} = \{(2M,j) : M+2 \le j \le 2M-1\}$; $\mathrm{FR} = \{(i,j) : 1 \le i,j \le 3M\} \backslash \mathrm{OT} \backslash \mathrm{OL} \backslash \mathrm{OB} \backslash \mathrm{OR} \backslash \mathrm{IT} \backslash \mathrm{IL} \backslash \mathrm{IB} \backslash \mathrm{IR} \backslash \{(M+1,M+1),(M+1,2M),(2M,2M),(2M,M+1)\}$. *Denote*

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}i,j &= \Phi\left(\frac{3r^0 - l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{3l^0 - r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right), (i,j) \in \mathrm{OT} \cup \mathrm{OL} \cup \mathrm{OB} \cup \mathrm{OR};\\
\mathcal{P}i,j &= \Phi\left(\frac{3r^0 + r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{3l^0 + l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right), (i,j) \in \mathrm{IT} \cup \mathrm{IL} \cup \mathrm{IB} \cup \mathrm{IR};\\
\mathcal{P}_{M+1,M+1} &= \Phi\left(\frac{2r^0 + 2r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,M+1}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{2l^0 + 2l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,M+1}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{M+1,2M} &= \Phi\left(\frac{2r^0 + 2r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,2M}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{2l^0 + 2l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,2M}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{2M,2M} &= \Phi\left(\frac{2r^0 + 2r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,2M}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{2l^0 + 2l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,2M}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{2M,M+1} &= \Phi\left(\frac{2r^0 + 2r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,M+1}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{2l^0 + 2l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,M+1}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}i,j &= \Phi\left(\frac{4r^0}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{4l^0}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right), (i,j) \in \mathrm{FR},
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.14}
$$

with $\Phi(\cdot)$ as the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution. Then

(1) $\mathcal{P}(\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\mathrm{ani}}(\mathbf{u})) \le \min\{\mathcal{P}_{i,j}, i,j = 1,\cdots,3M\}$;

(2) If $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}$ *(i.e., denoising problem),* $\mathcal{P}(\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\mathrm{ani}}(\mathbf{u})) \le \prod_{i,j=1}^{3M} \mathcal{P}_{i,j}$ *with* $|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2 = 1, \forall i,j = 1,\cdots,3M$.

Proof. Since $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex, $\varphi(\cdot)$ is convex. Assume $\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\mathrm{ani}}(\mathbf{u})$. It is necessary that

$$
\left(\nabla^{\mathsf{T}} \prod_{k,l=1}^{3M} \left(\partial\varphi((\nabla_x\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l}) \times \partial\varphi((\nabla_y\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l})\right)\right)_{i,j} + \alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}(\mathbf{A}\underline{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{f}))_{i,j} \ni 0, 1 \le i,j \le 3M,
$$

where $\partial\varphi((\nabla_x\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l})$ is the sub-differential of φ at $(\nabla_x\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l}$. Denote the sub-gradients in $\partial\varphi((\nabla_x\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l})$ and $\partial\varphi((\nabla_y\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l})$ as $g^1_{k,l}$ and $g^2_{k,l}$, respectively, $k,l = 1,\cdots,3M$. Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{P}(\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\mathrm{ani}}(\mathbf{u}))\\
=\ &\mathcal{P}\big(\exists g^1_{i,j} \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_x\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}), g^2_{i,j} \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_y\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}), 1 \le i,j \le 3M,\\
&\quad \text{s.t.}, g^1_{i-1,j} - g^1_{i,j} + g^2_{i,j-1} - g^2_{i,j} = \alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,j}, 1 \le i,j \le 3M\big)\\
\le\ &\mathcal{P}\big(\forall 1 \le i,j \le 3M, \exists g^1_{i,j} \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_x\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}), g^2_{i,j} \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_y\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}),\\
&\quad g^1_{i-1,j} \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_x\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i-1,j}), g^2_{i,j-1} \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_y\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j-1}),\\
&\quad \text{s.t.}, g^1_{i-1,j} - g^1_{i,j} + g^2_{i,j-1} - g^2_{i,j} = \alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,j}\big)
\end{aligned}
$$

due to the randomness of $\mathbf{n}$.

If we introduce, for each $(i,j), 1 \le i,j \le 3M$, the random event $\mathcal{E}_{i,j}$ as

$$
\partial\varphi((\nabla_x\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i-1,j}) - \partial\varphi((\nabla_x\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}) + \partial\varphi((\nabla_y\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j-1}) - \partial\varphi((\nabla_y\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,j}, \tag{5.15}
$$

it then follows that

$$\mathcal{P}(\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\mathrm{ani}}(\mathbf{u})) \leq \mathcal{P}\left(\bigcap_{i,j=1}^{3M} \mathcal{E}_{i,j}\right). \tag{5.16}$$

After representing $\{(\nabla_x \underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}, (\nabla_y \underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j} : 1 \leq i,j \leq 3M\}$ by forward differences, we have the random event $\mathcal{E}_{i,j}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_{i,M} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,M} \in \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi(0) + \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right)\}, \forall (i,M) \in \mathrm{OT};\\
\mathcal{E}_{M,j} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{M,j} \in \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right) + \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi(0)\}, \forall (M,j) \in \mathrm{OL};\\
\mathcal{E}_{i,2M+1} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,2M+1} \in \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi(0) + \partial\varphi\left(-\bar{U}\right) - \partial\varphi(0)\}, \forall (i,2M+1) \in \mathrm{OB};\\
\mathcal{E}_{2M+1,j} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{2M+1,j} \in \partial\varphi\left(-\bar{U}\right) - \partial\varphi(0) + \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi(0)\}, \forall (2M+1,j) \in \mathrm{OR};\\
\mathcal{E}_{i,M+1} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,M+1} \in \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi(0) + \partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right) - \partial\varphi(0)\}, \forall (i,M+1) \in \mathrm{IT};\\
\mathcal{E}_{M+1,j} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,j} \in \partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right) - \partial\varphi(0) + \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi(0)\}, \forall (M+1,j) \in \mathrm{IL};\\
\mathcal{E}_{i,2M} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,2M} \in \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi(0) + \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi\left(-\bar{U}\right)\}, \forall (i,2M) \in \mathrm{IB};\\
\mathcal{E}_{2M,j} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{2M,j} \in \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi\left(-\bar{U}\right) + \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi(0)\}, \forall (2M,j) \in \mathrm{IR};\\
\mathcal{E}_{M+1,M+1} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,M+1} \in \partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right) - \partial\varphi(0) + \partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right) - \partial\varphi(0)\};\\
\mathcal{E}_{M+1,2M} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,2M} \in \partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right) - \partial\varphi(0) + \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi\left(-\bar{U}\right)\};\\
\mathcal{E}_{2M,2M} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{2M,2M} \in \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi\left(-\bar{U}\right) + \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi\left(-\bar{U}\right)\};\\
\mathcal{E}_{2M,M+1} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{2M,M+1} \in \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi\left(-\bar{U}\right) + \partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right) - \partial\varphi(0)\};\\
\mathcal{E}_{i,j} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,j} \in \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi(0) + \partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi(0)\}, \forall (i,j) \in \mathrm{FR}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the convexity of $\partial\varphi(0), \partial\varphi(\bar{U}), \partial\varphi(-\bar{U})$ and the fact that $\partial\varphi(0)$ is symmetric with respect to the origin, we have, by Proposition 3.6,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_{i,j} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,j} \in 3\partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right)\}, \forall (i,j) \in \mathrm{OT} \cup \mathrm{OL};\\
\mathcal{E}_{i,j} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,j} \in 3\partial\varphi(0) + \partial\varphi\left(-\bar{U}\right)\}, \forall (i,j) \in \mathrm{OB} \cup \mathrm{OR};\\
\mathcal{E}_{i,j} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,j} \in 3\partial\varphi(0) + \partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right)\}, \forall (i,j) \in \mathrm{IT} \cup \mathrm{IL};\\
\mathcal{E}_{i,j} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,j} \in 3\partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi\left(-\bar{U}\right)\}, \forall (i,j) \in \mathrm{IB} \cup \mathrm{IR};\\
\mathcal{E}_{M+1,M+1} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,M+1} \in 2\partial\varphi(0) + 2\partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right)\};\\
\mathcal{E}_{M+1,2M} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,2M} \in 2\partial\varphi(0) + \partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right) - \partial\varphi\left(-\bar{U}\right)\};\\
\mathcal{E}_{2M,2M} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{2M,2M} \in 2\partial\varphi(0) + (-2)\partial\varphi\left(-\bar{U}\right)\};\\
\mathcal{E}_{2M,M+1} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{2M,M+1} \in 2\partial\varphi(0) + \partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right) - \partial\varphi\left(-\bar{U}\right)\};\\
\mathcal{E}_{i,j} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,j} \in 4\partial\varphi(0)\}, \forall (i,j) \in \mathrm{FR}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.2 indicates $\partial\varphi(-\bar{U}) = -\partial\varphi(\bar{U}) = [-r^1, -l^1]$. Using Proposition 3.6 again, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_{i,j} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,j} \in 3\partial\varphi(0) - \partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right)\}, \forall (i,j) \in \mathrm{OT} \cup \mathrm{OL} \cup \mathrm{OB} \cup \mathrm{OR};\\
\mathcal{E}_{i,j} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,j} \in 3\partial\varphi(0) + \partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right)\}, \forall (i,j) \in \mathrm{IT} \cup \mathrm{IL} \cup \mathrm{IB} \cup \mathrm{IR};\\
\mathcal{E}_{M+1,M+1} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,M+1} \in 2\partial\varphi(0) + 2\partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right)\};\\
\mathcal{E}_{M+1,2M} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,2M} \in 2\partial\varphi(0) + 2\partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right)\};\\
\mathcal{E}_{2M,2M} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{2M,2M} \in 2\partial\varphi(0) + 2\partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right)\};\\
\mathcal{E}_{2M,M+1} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{2M,M+1} \in 2\partial\varphi(0) + 2\partial\varphi\left(\bar{U}\right)\};\\
\mathcal{E}_{i,j} &= \{\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,j} \in 4\partial\varphi(0)\}, \forall (i,j) \in \mathrm{FR}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $n_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0,\sigma^2), 1 \le j \le N$ are i.i.d and $\partial\varphi(0) = [l^0, r^0], \partial\varphi(\bar{U}) = [l^1, r^1]$, the probabilities of $\mathcal{E}_{i,j}$ can be calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{i,j} &= \Phi\left(\frac{3r^0 - l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{3l^0 - r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right), \forall (i,j) \in \mathrm{OT} \cup \mathrm{OL} \cup \mathrm{OB} \cup \mathrm{OR};\\
\mathcal{P}_{i,j} &= \Phi\left(\frac{3r^0 + r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{3l^0 + l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right), \forall (i,j) \in \mathrm{IT} \cup \mathrm{IL} \cup \mathrm{IB} \cup \mathrm{IR};\\
\mathcal{P}_{M+1,M+1} &= \Phi\left(\frac{2r^0 + 2r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,M+1}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{2l^0 + 2l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,M+1}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{M+1,2M} &= \Phi\left(\frac{2r^0 + 2r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,2M}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{2l^0 + 2l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,2M}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{2M,2M} &= \Phi\left(\frac{2r^0 + 2r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,2M}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{2l^0 + 2l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,2M}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{2M,M+1} &= \Phi\left(\frac{2r^0 + 2r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,M+1}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{2l^0 + 2l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,M+1}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{i,j} &= \Phi\left(\frac{4r^0}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{4l^0}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right), \forall (i,j) \in \mathrm{FR},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution.

Therefore, Eqn. (5.16) gives

$$\mathcal{P}(\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\mathrm{ani}}(\mathbf{u})) \le \mathcal{P}\left(\bigcap_{i,j=1}^{3M} \mathcal{E}_{i,j}\right) \le \min\{\mathcal{P}_{i,j}, i,j = 1,\cdots,3M\},$$

which is exactly (1). If $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}$ (i.e., denoising problem), then the random events $\mathcal{E}_{i,j}$ defined in (5.15) are independent. Therefore (2) holds. ■

The above proof also indicates the following result, where the image is a general one.

Theorem 5.10 *For a general image $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$ and its noisy degradation $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{n}$. Suppose that $\varphi(\cdot)$ is convex. For $i,j = 1,\cdots,N$, denote*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}_{i,j} =& \Phi\left(\frac{\sup\{g : g \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_x\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i-1,j}) - \partial\varphi((\nabla_x\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}) + \partial\varphi((\nabla_y\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j-1}) - \partial\varphi((\nabla_y\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j})\}}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right)\\
&- \Phi\left(\frac{\inf\{g : g \in \partial\varphi((\nabla_x\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i-1,j}) - \partial\varphi((\nabla_x\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}) + \partial\varphi((\nabla_y\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j-1}) - \partial\varphi((\nabla_y\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j})\}}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

with $\Phi(\cdot)$ as the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution. Then we have
(1) $\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\mathrm{ani}}(\mathbf{u})) \le \min\{\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}, i,j = 1,\cdots,N\}$;

(2) If $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}$ (i.e., denoising problem), $\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\mathrm{ani}}(\mathbf{u})) \le \prod_{i,j=1}^{N} \mathcal{Q}_{i,j}$ with $|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2 = 1, \forall i,j = 1,\cdots,N$.

Theorem 5.11 *Suppose $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex. Let $l^0 = -\rho\prime(0+), r^0 = \rho\prime(0+); l^1 = \rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right), r^1 = \rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right); l^2 = \rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}-\right), r^2 = \rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}+\right)$. Denote*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{i,M} &= \Phi\left(\frac{r^0 - l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,M}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{l^0 - r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,M}|_2}\right), M+2 \le i \le 2M;\\
\mathcal{P}_{M,j} &= \Phi\left(\frac{r^0 - l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M,j}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{l^0 - r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M,j}|_2}\right), M+2 \le j \le 2M;\\
\mathcal{P}_{i,2M+1} &= \Phi\left(\frac{3r^0 - l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,2M+1}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{3l^0 - r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,2M+1}|_2}\right), M+1 \le i \le 2M-1;
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{2M+1,j} &= \Phi\left(\frac{3r^0 - l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M+1,j}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{3l^0 - r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M+1,j}|_2}\right), M+1 \le j \le 2M-1;\\
\mathcal{P}_{i,M+1} &= \Phi\left(\frac{3r^0 + r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,M+1}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{3l^0 + l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,M+1}|_2}\right), M+2 \le i \le 2M-1;\\
\mathcal{P}_{M+1,j} &= \Phi\left(\frac{3r^0 + r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,j}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{3l^0 + l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,j}|_2}\right), M+2 \le j \le 2M-1;\\
\mathcal{P}_{i,2M} &= \Phi\left(\frac{r^0 + r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,2M}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{l^0 + l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,2M}|_2}\right), M+2 \le i \le 2M-1;\\
\mathcal{P}_{2M,j} &= \Phi\left(\frac{r^0 + r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,j}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{l^0 + l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,j}|_2}\right), M+2 \le j \le 2M-1;\\
\mathcal{P}_{M+1,M} &= \Phi\left(\frac{2r^0 - l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,M}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{2l^0 - r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,M}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{2M+1,M} &= \Phi\left(\frac{3r^0}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M+1,M}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{3l^0}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M+1,M}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{M+1,M} &= \Phi\left(\frac{2r^0 - l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M,M+1}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{2l^0 - r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M,M+1}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{M,2M+1} &= \Phi\left(\frac{3r^0}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M,2M+1}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{3l^0}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M,2M+1}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{2M,2M+1} &= \Phi\left(\frac{3r^0 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}l^2}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,2M+1}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{3l^0 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}r^2}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,2M+1}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{2M+1,2M} &= \Phi\left(\frac{3r^0 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}l^2}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M+1,2M}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{3l^0 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}r^2}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M+1,2M}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{M+1,M+1} &= \Phi\left(\frac{2r^0 + 2r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,M+1}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{2l^0 + 2l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,M+1}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{2M,M+1} &= \Phi\left(\frac{r^0 + 2r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,M+1}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{l^0 + 2l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,M+1}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{M+1,2M} &= \Phi\left(\frac{r^0 + 2r^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,2M}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{l^0 + 2l^1}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,2M}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{2M,2M} &= \Phi\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}r^2}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,2M}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}l^2}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,2M}|_2}\right);\\
\mathcal{P}_{i,j} &= \Phi\left(\frac{4r^0}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{4l^0}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right), \text{otherwise};
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.17}
$$

with $\Phi(\cdot)$ as the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution. Then we have

(1) $\mathcal{P}(\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u})) \le \min\{\mathcal{P}_{i,j}, i,j = 1,\cdots,3M\}$.

(2) If $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}$ *(i.e., denoising problem),* $\mathcal{P}(\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u})) \le \prod_{i,j=1}^{3M} \mathcal{P}_{i,j}$ *with* $|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2 = 1, \forall i,j = 1,\cdots,3M$.

Proof. Since $\rho(\cdot)$ is convex, $\psi(\cdot,\cdot)$ is convex. Assume $\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u})$. It is then necessary that

$$
\left(\nabla^{\mathsf{T}} \prod_{k,l=1}^{3M} \partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l})\right)_{i,j} + \alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}(\mathbf{A}\underline{\mathbf{u}} - \mathbf{f}))_{i,j} \ni 0, \quad 1 \le i,j \le 3M,
$$

where $\partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l})$ is the sub-differential of ψ at $(\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l}$. Denote the sub-gradients in $\partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{k,l})$

as $\mathbf{g}_{k,l} = (g^1_{k,l}, g^2_{k,l}), k, l = 1, \cdots, 3M$, respectively. Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{P}(\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u})) \\
=\ &\mathcal{P}\big(\exists \mathbf{g}_{i,j} \in \partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}), 1 \le i,j \le 3M, \\
&\quad \text{s.t.}, g^1_{i-1,j} - g^1_{i,j} + g^2_{i,j-1} - g^2_{i,j} = \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,j}, 1 \le i,j \le 3M\big) \\
\le\ &\mathcal{P}\big(\forall 1 \le i,j \le 3M, \exists \mathbf{g}_{i,j} \in \partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}), \mathbf{g}_{i-1,j} \in \partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i-1,j}), \mathbf{g}_{i,j-1} \in \partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j-1}), \\
&\quad \text{s.t.}, g^1_{i-1,j} - g^1_{i,j} + g^2_{i,j-1} - g^2_{i,j} = \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,j}\big)
\end{aligned}
$$

due to the randomness of $\mathbf{n}$.

If we introduce, for each $(i,j), 1 \le i,j \le 3M$, the random event $\mathcal{E}_{i,j}$ as

$$
\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i-1,j})) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j})) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j-1})) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j})) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,j}, \tag{5.18}
$$

it then follows that

$$
\mathcal{P}(\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u})) \le \mathcal{P}\left(\bigcap_{i,j=1}^{3M} \mathcal{E}_{i,j}\right). \tag{5.19}
$$

Here and in the following, $\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j})), \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}))$ are the projections of the set of the sub-differential $\partial\psi((\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j})$ to the $x-$ and $y-$ axes.

After representing $\{(\nabla\underline{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j} : 1 \le i,j \le 3M\}$ by forward differences, we have the random event $\mathcal{E}_{i,j}$ as follows

$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(0,\bar{U}\right)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(0,\bar{U}\right)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(0,\bar{U}\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,M}, \forall M+2 \le i \le 2M;$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M,j}, \forall M+2 \le j \le 2M;$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(0,-\bar{U}\right)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,2M+1}, \forall M+1 \le i \le 2M-1;$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},0\right)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M+1,j}, \forall M+1 \le j \le 2M-1;$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(0,\bar{U}\right)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,M+1}, \forall M+2 \le i \le 2M-1;$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,j}, \forall M+2 \le j \le 2M-1;$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(0,-\bar{U}\right)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(0,-\bar{U}\right)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(0,-\bar{U}\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,2M}, \forall M+2 \le i \le 2M-1;$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},0\right)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},0\right)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},0\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M,j}, \forall M+2 \le j \le 2M-1;$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(0,\bar{U}\right)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(0,\bar{U}\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,M};$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(0,\bar{U}\right)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M+1,M};$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M,M+1};$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M,2M+1};$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},-\bar{U}\right)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M,2M+1};$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},-\bar{U}\right)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M+1,2M};$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(0,\bar{U}\right)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,M+1};$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},0\right)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(0,\bar{U}\right)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},0\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M,M+1};$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(0,-\bar{U}\right)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(0,-\bar{U}\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,2M};$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(0,-\bar{U}\right)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},-\bar{U}\right)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},0\right)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},-\bar{U}\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M,2M};$
$\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,j}, \text{otherwise};$

We now reveal the structures of the above sub-differentials. According to Proposition 3.7, $\partial\psi(0,0)$ is a circle centered at the origin with the radius $\rho\prime(0+)$. Also, $\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right) = \{(g^1,0) : g^1 \in [\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right), \rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)]\}$. That is, $\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) = [\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right), \rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)]$ and $\mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) = \{0\}$. Similarly, if $(g^1,g^2) \in \partial\psi\left(\bar{U},\bar{U}\right)$, then it is necessary that $g^1 \in [\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}-\right), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}+\right)]$,

$g^2 \in [\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}-\right), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}+\right)]$. Note this is not a sufficient condition. Anyway, we have $\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},\bar{U}\right)) \subseteq [\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}-\right), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}+\right)]$ and $\mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},\bar{U}\right)) \subseteq [\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}-\right), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}+\right)]$.

These structures, together with Proposition 3.6 and the symmetry of the sub-differentials (see Proposition 3.2), are used to simplify the random event $\mathcal{E}_{i,j}$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(0,\bar{U}\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,M}, \forall M+2 \le i \le 2M;\\
&\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M,j}, \forall M+2 \le j \le 2M;\\
&3\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(0,-\bar{U}\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,2M+1}, \forall M+1 \le i \le 2M-1;\\
&\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},0\right)) + 3\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M+1,j}, \forall M+1 \le j \le 2M-1;\\
&3\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(0,\bar{U}\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,M+1}, \forall M+2 \le i \le 2M-1;\\
&\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) + 3\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,j}, \forall M+2 \le j \le 2M-1;\\
&\mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(0,-\bar{U}\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,2M}, \forall M+2 \le i \le 2M-1;\\
&\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},0\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M,j}, \forall M+2 \le j \le 2M-1;\\
&2\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(0,\bar{U}\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,M};\\
&3\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M+1,M};\\
&2\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M,M+1};\\
&3\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M,2M+1};\\
&3\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},-\bar{U}\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M,2M+1};\\
&\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},-\bar{U}\right)) + 3\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M+1,2M};\\
&2\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) + 2\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,M+1};\\
&\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) + 2\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M,M+1};\\
&2\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(\bar{U},0\right)) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,2M};\\
&-\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},-\bar{U}\right)) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi\left(-\bar{U},-\bar{U}\right)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M,2M};\\
&4\mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi(0,0)) \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,j}, \text{otherwise.}
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore the probabilities of the random events $\mathcal{E}_{i,j}$ are equal to or less than the following events

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)] - [\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right),\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)] \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,M}, \forall M+2 \le i \le 2M;\\
&[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)] - [\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right),\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)] \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M,j}, \forall M+2 \le j \le 2M;\\
&3[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)] - [\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right),\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)] \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,2M+1}, \forall M+1 \le i \le 2M-1;\\
&3[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)] - [\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right),\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)] \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M+1,j}, \forall M+1 \le j \le 2M-1;\\
&3[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)] + [\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right),\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)] \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,M+1}, \forall M+2 \le i \le 2M-1;\\
&3[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)] + [\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right),\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)] \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,j}, \forall M+2 \le j \le 2M-1;\\
&[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)] + [\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right),\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)] \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{i,2M}, \forall M+2 \le i \le 2M-1;\\
&[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)] + [\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right),\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)] \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M,j}, \forall M+2 \le j \le 2M-1;\\
&2[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)] - [\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right),\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)] \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,M};\\
&3[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)] \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M+1,M};\\
&2[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)] - [\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right),\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)] \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M,M+1};\\
&3[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)] \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M,2M+1};\\
&3[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)] - [\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}-\right),\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}+\right)] \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M,2M+1};\\
&3[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)] - [\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}-\right),\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}+\right)] \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{2M+1,2M};\\
&2[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)] + 2[\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right),\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)] \ni \alpha(\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,M+1};
\end{aligned}
$$

$$[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)]+2[\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right),\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)]\ni\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{2M,M+1};$$
$$[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)]+2[\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right),\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)]\ni\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{M+1,2M};$$
$$2[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}-\right),\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}+\right)]\ni\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{2M,2M};$$
$$4[-\rho\prime(0+),\rho\prime(0+)]\ni\alpha(\mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{n})_{i,j},\text{otherwise.}$$

Since $\mathbf{n}_{i,j}\sim\mathcal{N}(0,\sigma^2),1\leq i,j\leq N$ are i.i.d, the probabilities of the above random events are as follows

$$\Phi\left(\frac{\rho\prime(0+)-\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,M}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-\rho\prime(0+)-\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,M}|_2}\right),M+2\leq i\leq 2M;$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{\rho\prime(0+)-\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M,j}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-\rho\prime(0+)-\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M,j}|_2}\right),M+2\leq j\leq 2M;$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{3\rho\prime(0+)-\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,2M+1}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-3\rho\prime(0+)-\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,2M+1}|_2}\right),M+1\leq i\leq 2M-1;$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{3\rho\prime(0+)-\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M+1,j}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-3\rho\prime(0+)-\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M+1,j}|_2}\right),M+1\leq j\leq 2M-1;$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{3\rho\prime(0+)+\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,M+1}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-3\rho\prime(0+)+\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,M+1}|_2}\right),M+2\leq i\leq 2M-1;$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{3\rho\prime(0+)+\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,j}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-3\rho\prime(0+)+\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,j}|_2}\right),M+2\leq j\leq 2M-1;$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{\rho\prime(0+)+\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,2M}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-\rho\prime(0+)+\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,2M}|_2}\right),M+2\leq i\leq 2M-1;$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{\rho\prime(0+)+\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,j}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-\rho\prime(0+)+\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,j}|_2}\right),M+2\leq j\leq 2M-1;$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{2\rho\prime(0+)-\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,M}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-2\rho\prime(0+)-\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,M}|_2}\right);$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{3\rho\prime(0+)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M+1,M}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-3\rho\prime(0+)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M+1,M}|_2}\right);$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{2\rho\prime(0+)-\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M,M+1}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-2\rho\prime(0+)-\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M,M+1}|_2}\right);$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{3\rho\prime(0+)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M,2M+1}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-3\rho\prime(0+)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M,2M+1}|_2}\right);$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{3\rho\prime(0+)-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}-\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,2M+1}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-3\rho\prime(0+)-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}+\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,2M+1}|_2}\right);$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{3\rho\prime(0+)-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}-\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M+1,2M}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-3\rho\prime(0+)-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}+\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M+1,2M}|_2}\right);$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{2\rho\prime(0+)+2\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,M+1}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-2\rho\prime(0+)+2\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,M+1}|_2}\right);$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{\rho\prime(0+)+2\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,M+1}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-\rho\prime(0+)+2\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,M+1}|_2}\right);$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{\rho\prime(0+)+2\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}+\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,2M}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-\rho\prime(0+)+2\rho\prime\left(\bar{U}-\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{M+1,2M}|_2}\right);$$

$$\Phi\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}+\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,2M}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}\rho\prime\left(\sqrt{2}\bar{U}-\right)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{2M,2M}|_2}\right);$$
$$\Phi\left(\frac{4\rho\prime(0+)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{-4\rho\prime(0+)}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right), \text{otherwise.}$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution.

With the notations $l^0, r^0; l^1, r^1; l^2, r^2$ and those in Eq. (5.17), Eq. (5.19) gives

$$\mathcal{P}(\underline{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u})) \leq \min\{\mathcal{P}_{i,j}, i, j = 1, \cdots, 3M\},$$

which is exactly (1). If $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}$ (i.e., denoising problem), then the random events $\mathcal{E}_{i,j}$ defined in (5.18) are independent. Therefore (2) holds. ■

The above proof also indicates the following result, where the image is a general one.

Theorem 5.12 *For a general image $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$ and its noisy degradation $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{A}\tilde{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{n}$. Suppose that $\psi(\cdot)$ is convex. For $i, j = 1, \cdots, N$, denote*

$$\mathcal{Q}_{i,j} = \Phi\left(\frac{\sup\{g : g \in \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi((\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i-1,j})) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi((\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j})) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi((\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j-1})) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi((\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}))\}}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right)$$
$$- \Phi\left(\frac{\inf\{g : g \in \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi((\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i-1,j})) - \mathrm{P}^x(\partial\psi((\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j})) + \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi((\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j-1})) - \mathrm{P}^y(\partial\psi((\nabla\tilde{\mathbf{u}})_{i,j}))\}}{\alpha\sigma|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2}\right),$$

with $\Phi(\cdot)$ as the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution. Then

(1) $\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u})) \leq \min\{\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}, i, j = 1, \cdots, N\}$;

(2) If $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}$ (i.e., denoising problem), $\mathcal{P}(\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \arg\min_{\mathbf{u}} E_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u})) \leq \prod_{i,j=1}^{N} \mathcal{Q}_{i,j}$ with $|\mathbf{a}_{i,j}|_2 = 1, \forall i, j = 1, \cdots, N$.

Remark 10 *From Theorem 5.9 and Theorem 5.11, we have some inferences similar to those in Remark 6.*

6 Truncated regularization: a general technique to design nonconvex and nonsmooth regularizers

The above sections indicate in some sense that, it is worthy to consider nonsmooth and nonconvex regularizers in variational signal and image restoration. Due to Theorem 4.4, Theorem 5.5 and Theorem 5.6, the regularizer function is suggested to be flat on $[\tau, +\infty]$ for some positive τ, which is related to the contrast of the signal or image data. Also, the non-differentiability of the regularizer function at 0 is good for piecewise constant signal and image restoration. Therefore, to design new regularizer functions, we consider to truncate those regularizer functions in the literature which are non-differentiable at 0.

Remark 11 *So far only ℓ_p regularizer has truncated version in the literature; see [3] for ℓ_2, [13] for $\ell_p, 1 \leq p \leq 2$, and [33] for $\ell_p, 0 \leq p < 1$. Each of them was proposed individually.*

For a regularizer function $\rho(\cdot)$, we construct a new regularizer function

$$\mathcal{T}(\cdot) = \rho_\tau(\cdot) = \rho(\min(\cdot, \tau)), \tag{6.1}$$

where $\tau > 0$ is a positive real parameter. This regularizer function is flat on $(\tau, +\infty)$. It is easy to see that, if $\rho(\cdot)$ satisfies the basic assumptions (AS1)(AS2)(AS3), $\mathcal{T}(\cdot) = \rho_\tau(\cdot)$ also satisfies

the basic assumptions (AS1)(AS2)(AS3). $\mathcal{T}(\cdot)$ is however always nonconvex and nonsmooth. Also, $\mathcal{T}(\cdot) = \rho_\tau(\cdot)$ degenerates to $\rho(\cdot)$, when $\tau = +\infty$. In the following, τ takes a finite positive real value, unless pointed out specifically.

With $\mathcal{T}(\cdot) = \rho(\min(\cdot, \tau))$ replacing $\rho(\cdot)$ in φ and ψ in the variational problems (2.1) (2.2) and (2.3), the energy functions $E(\cdot)$ in (2.1), $E_{\text{ani}}(\cdot)$ in (2.2), and $E_{\text{iso}}(\cdot)$ in (2.3) are coercive if and only if $A^\mathsf{T}A$ ($\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{A}$) is invertible. To ensure $E(\cdot), E_{\text{ani}}(\cdot), E_{\text{iso}}(\cdot)$ to be coercive, we assume, from now on, the following

(AS4) $A^\mathsf{T}A$ ($\mathbf{A}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{A}$) is invertible.

Basic calculations show that, for those regularizer functions in the literature with non-differentiability at 0 (e.g. the regularizer functions in Table 1), the so called subadditivity holds. Actually, their truncated versions also have the subadditivity property.

Lemma 6.1 *Given $a, b \geq 0, \tau > 0$, then*

$$\min(a + b, \tau) \leq \min(a, \tau) + \min(b, \tau). \tag{6.2}$$

Proof. Case 1: $0 \leq a + b \leq \tau$. Then $0 \leq a, b \leq \tau$. Therefore, $\min(a + b, \tau) = a + b = \min(a, \tau) + \min(b, \tau)$.

Case 2: $a + b > \tau$. If $0 \leq a, b < \tau$, then $\min(a, \tau) + \min(b, \tau) = a + b > \tau = \min(a + b, \tau)$. If $a \geq \tau$ or $b \geq \tau$, then $\min(a, \tau) + \min(b, \tau) \geq \tau = \min(a + b, \tau)$. ■

Proposition 6.2 *Given $\tau > 0$, if $\rho(\cdot)$ satisfies the subadditivity over $[0, +\infty)$ and the assumptions (AS1)(AS2), then its truncated version $\mathcal{T}(\cdot) = \rho(\min(\cdot, \tau))$ also has the subadditivity property over $[0, +\infty)$.*

Proof. For $\forall a, b \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}(a + b) = \rho(\min(a + b, \tau)) &\leq \rho(\min(a, \tau) + \min(b, \tau)) \\ &\leq \rho(\min(a, \tau)) + \rho(\min(b, \tau)) = \mathcal{T}(a) + \mathcal{T}(b),\end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the subadditivity property of $\mathcal{T}(\cdot)$ over $[0, +\infty)$. ■

Table 1: Some regularizer functions satisfying the subadditivity, where $0 < p < 1, \theta > 0$

$\rho_1(s) = s$
$\rho_2(s) = s^p$
$\rho_3(s) = \ln(\theta s + 1)$
$\rho_4(s) = \frac{\theta s}{1+\theta s}$
$\rho_5(0) = 0, \varphi_3(s) = 1$ if $s > 0$
$\rho_6(s) = \ln(\theta s^p + 1)$
$\rho_7(s) = \frac{\theta s^p}{1+\theta s^p}$

7 Truncated regularization for 1D signal restoration: Some analytic results

In this section we present and prove some analytic results on variational 1D signal restoration using truncated regularization.

Assume $\emptyset \neq \Omega \subsetneq J = \{1, \cdots, N\}$. Let $\mathbf{1}_\Omega$ be its indicator function and $\zeta > 0$ a real number. We define two index sets

$$J_0 = \{i : (\nabla_x \mathbf{1}_\Omega)_i = 0\};\ J_1 = \{i : (\nabla_x \mathbf{1}_\Omega)_i \neq 0\} = J \setminus J_0.$$

Consider now the minimization problem (2.1) using truncated regularization where $f = A(\zeta \mathbf{1}_\Omega) \in \mathbb{R}^K$. For clarity, let us denote

$$E^\zeta(u) = \sum_{1\le i\le N} \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x u)_i|) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|A(u-\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^K}, \tag{7.1}$$

where the regularizer function $\mathcal{T}$ reads (6.1).

The following theorem shows the perfect recovery (i.e., contrast preservation) of the the signal $\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega$ under some condition on the model parameters, whose proof is motivated by [30].

Theorem 7.1 *If $\zeta > \tau + \sqrt{\frac{4\mathcal{T}(\tau)}{\alpha\mu_{\min}}\#J_1}$, then the global minimizer is $\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega$. Here $\mu_{\min} > 0$ is the minimal eigenvalue of A^TA.*

Proof. It is clear that $E^\zeta(\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega) = \sum_{1\le i\le N} \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_i|) = \sum_{i\in J_1} \mathcal{T}(\zeta) \le \#J_1\mathcal{T}(\tau)$.

Assume v be the global minimizer. We define two index sets

$$J_0^v = \{i : |(\nabla_x v)_i| \le \tau\};\ J_1^v = \{i : |(\nabla_x v)_i| > \tau\} = J \setminus J_0^v.$$

We first check $J_0^v = J_0; J_1^v = J_1$ by contradiction. Assume $J_0^v \cap J_1 \neq \emptyset$. There exists i such that

$$|(\nabla_x v)_i| = |v_{i+1} - v_i| \le \tau;\ |(\nabla_x\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_i| = \zeta.$$

It then follows, under the assumption $\zeta > \tau + \sqrt{\frac{4\mathcal{T}(\tau)}{\alpha\mu_{\min}}\#J_1}$, that

$$\begin{aligned} E^\zeta(v) \ge \frac{\alpha}{2}\|A(v-\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^K} &\ge \frac{\alpha}{2}\mu_{\min}\|v-\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^K} \\ &\ge \frac{\alpha}{2}\mu_{\min}((v_{i+1}-\zeta)^2 + (v_i-0)^2) \\ &\ge \frac{\alpha}{2}\mu_{\min}\frac{1}{2}(\zeta-\tau)^2 \\ &> \#J_1\mathcal{T}(\tau) \ge E^\zeta(\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. It holds that $J_0^v \cap J_1 = \emptyset$. Now assume $J_1 \subsetneq J_1^v$. Then $\#J_1^v \ge \#J_1 + 1$ and $\|A(v-\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^K} > 0$. By the definition of J_1^v, it then follows that

$$E^\zeta(v) > \#J_1^v\mathcal{T}(\tau) \ge (\#J_1+1)\mathcal{T}(\tau) > (\#J_1)\mathcal{T}(\tau) \ge E^\zeta(\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega),$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, $J_0^v = J_0; J_1^v = J_1$.

If the global minimizer $v \neq \zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega$, then $\|A(v-\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^K} > 0$ and

$$\sum_{i\in J_1^v} \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x v)_i|) = \sum_{i\in J_1^v} \mathcal{T}(\tau) = \sum_{i\in J_1} \mathcal{T}(\zeta) = \sum_{i\in J_1} \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_i|),$$

where we used $\zeta > \tau$ by the assumption. It then follows that

$$E^\zeta(v) > E^\zeta(\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega),$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, the global minimizer is $\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega$. ■

Remark 12

- *From the proof, one can see that Theorem 7.1 holds for any truncated regularizers.*
- *Theorem 7.1 can be extended to 2D case.*

For a general parameter setting, it is quite difficult to give the structure of the global minimizer. However, if the regularizer function satisfies the subadditivity and the $A^\mathsf{T}A$ is a diagonal matrix (with image denoising as a special case where $A^\mathsf{T}A = I$), we can show some structure of the global minimizer.

Theorem 7.2 *Assume $A^\mathsf{T}A = \mathrm{diag}\{d_1, d_2, \cdots, d_N\}, d_i > 0, i = 1, 2, \cdots, N$ and the regularizer function $\mathcal{T}(\cdot)$ in (7.1) to satisfy the subadditivity (Note here we do not require the finiteness of τ). Let v be the global minimizer of (7.1), then*

(1) The extremum principle holds, i.e., $0 \le v_i \le \zeta$ for all $i \in J$;

(2) No new (and thus false) discontinuity appears in v, i.e., $J_1^* = \{i \in J : (\nabla_x v)_i \neq 0\} \subseteq J_1$;

(3) v preserves the monotonicity (not necessary strict by (2)) from the input signal $\zeta \mathbf{1}_\Omega$.

Proof. (1) We show, by contradiction, that $0 \le v_i \le \zeta$ for all $i \in J$. Assume that $v_j < 0$ for some $j \in J$. We define a new signal $\bar{v}$ by

$$\bar{v}_i = \begin{cases} 0, & i \in \{j : v_j < 0\}, \\ v_i, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For each i, there are four cases for $|v_{i+1} - v_i|$ and $|\bar{v}_{i+1} - \bar{v}_i|$:

(i) $v_{i+1}, v_i \ge 0$: $|\bar{v}_{i+1} - \bar{v}_i| = |v_{i+1} - v_i|$;

(ii) $v_{i+1}, v_i < 0$: $|\bar{v}_{i+1} - \bar{v}_i| = 0 \le |v_{i+1} - v_i|$;

(iii) $v_{i+1} \ge 0, v_i < 0$: $|\bar{v}_{i+1} - \bar{v}_i| = |v_{i+1} - 0| = v_{i+1} < v_{i+1} - v_i = |v_{i+1} - v_i|$;

(iv) $v_{i+1} < 0, v_i \ge 0$: $|\bar{v}_{i+1} - \bar{v}_i| = |0 - v_i| = v_i < v_i - v_{i+1} = |v_{i+1} - v_i|$;

all of which indicate that $|(\nabla_x v)_i| = |v_{i+1} - v_i| \ge |\bar{v}_{i+1} - \bar{v}_i| = |(\nabla_x \bar{v})_i|$ always holds. Thus,

$$\mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x v)_i|) \ge \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x \bar{v})_i|),\ i \in J.$$

It implies that

$$\begin{aligned} E^\zeta(v) - E^\zeta(\bar{v}) &= \sum_{i \in J} \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x v)_i|) - \sum_{i \in J} \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x \bar{v})_i|) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|A(v - \zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)\|_{\mathbb{R}^K}^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\|A(\bar{v} - \zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)\|_{\mathbb{R}^K}^2 \\ &\ge \frac{\alpha}{2}\|A(v - \zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)\|_{\mathbb{R}^K}^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\|A(\bar{v} - \zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)\|_{\mathbb{R}^K}^2 \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{2}\sum_{i \in J} d_i |(v - \zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_i|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\sum_{i \in J} d_i |(\bar{v} - \zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_i|^2 \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{2}\sum_{i, v_i < 0} d_i (|(v - \zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_i|^2 - |(0 - \zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_i|^2) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the fact that v is the the global minimizer of (7.1). Thus we have $v_i \ge 0$ for all $i \in J$. In the similar way we can prove that $v_i \le \zeta$ for all $i \in J$. This is the extremum principle.

(2) Now we prove $J_1^* = \{i \in J : (\nabla_x v)_i \neq 0\} \subseteq J_1$. If $J_1^* = \emptyset$, then $J_1^* \subseteq J_1$ holds. We consider that J_1^* is nonempty. Suppose there exists $j \in J_1^*$ but $j \notin J_1$. That is, $v_j \neq v_{j+1}$ and $j \in J_0$. In total there are four cases:

(i) $v_j > v_{j+1}$ and $(\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_j = (\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_{j+1} = 0$;

(ii) $v_j > v_{j+1}$ and $(\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_j = (\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_{j+1} = \zeta$;

(iii) $v_j < v_{j+1}$ and $(\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_j = (\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_{j+1} = 0$;

(iv) $v_j < v_{j+1}$ and $(\zeta \mathbf{1}_\Omega)_j = (\zeta \mathbf{1}_\Omega)_{j+1} = \zeta$.

Without loss of generality, we consider case (i). Define a new vector by

$$\tilde{v}_i = \begin{cases} v_{i+1}, & i = j, \\ v_i, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{v}$ only differs from v at index j, we want to show $E^\zeta(\tilde{v}) < E^\zeta(v)$. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&E^\zeta(v) - E^\zeta(\tilde{v}) \\
&= \sum_{i\in J} \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x v)_i|) - \sum_{i\in J} \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x \tilde{v})_i|) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|A(v - \zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^K} - \frac{\alpha}{2}\|A(\tilde{v} - \zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^K} \\
&= \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x v)_{j-1}|) + \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x v)_j|) - \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x \tilde{v})_{j-1}|) - \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x \tilde{v})_j|) + \frac{\alpha}{2} d_j |(v - \zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_j|^2 - \frac{\alpha}{2} d_j |(\tilde{v} - \zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_j|^2 \\
&= \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x v)_{j-1}|) + \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x v)_j|) - \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x \tilde{v})_{j-1}|) + \frac{\alpha}{2} d_j (|v_j|^2 - |v_{j+1}|^2) \\
&> \mathcal{T}(|v_j - v_{j-1}|) + \mathcal{T}(|v_{j+1} - v_j|) - \mathcal{T}(|v_{j+1} - v_{j-1}|).
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from $v_j > v_{j+1}$ and the extremum principle proved in (1). Since it follows that $\mathcal{T}(|v_{j+1} - v_{j-1}|) \le \mathcal{T}(|v_j - v_{j-1}|) + \mathcal{T}(|v_{j+1} - v_j|)$ by the subadditivity, we have $E^\zeta(v) - E^\zeta(\tilde{v}) > 0$. This contradicts that v is a global minimizer. For other three cases we can obtain similarly (by defining different new vectors) this contradiction. Therefore, $i \in J_1^*$ implies $i \in J_1$. That is, $J_1^* \subseteq J_1$.

(3) We prove the result by contradiction. Without loss of generality, we assume there exists $j \in J$ such that $(\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_j \le (\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_{j+1}$ but $v_j > v_{j+1}$. If $(\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_j = (\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_{j+1}$, (2) gives $v_j = v_{j+1}$, which is a contradiction. If $(\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_j < (\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega)_{j+1}$, we define a new vector by

$$\hat{v}_i = \begin{cases} v_{i+1}, & i = j, \\ v_i, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By a similar method in (2), we can show $E^\zeta(\hat{v}) < E^\zeta(v)$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, v preserves the monotonicity (not necessary strict by (2)) from the input signal $\zeta\mathbf{1}_\Omega$. ■

8 Truncated regularization for 2D image restoration: Numerical method

In this section, we present a numerical method to handle the variational 2D image restoration using truncated regularization.

For simplicity of presentation, we denote the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{K\times K}$ by V and $(\mathbb{R}^{N\times N})\times(\mathbb{R}^{N\times N})$ by Q. V and Q are equipped with inner products $(\cdot,\cdot)_V, (\cdot,\cdot)_Q$ and Euclidean norms $\|\cdot\|_V, \|\cdot\|_Q$, respectively; See, e.g., [46]. In addition, we mention that for $\mathbf{q} \in Q$, $\mathbf{q}_{i,j} = (q^{(1)}_{i,j}, q^{(2)}_{i,j})$ and $|\mathbf{q}_{i,j}| = \sqrt{(q^{(1)}_{i,j})^2 + (q^{(2)}_{i,j})^2}$ as the usual pixel-by-pixel Euclidean norm.

8.1 Anisotropic and isotropic 2D truncated regularization models

Our anisotropic and isotropic 2D truncated regularization models for image restoration are presented as follows:

- *Anisotropic 2D truncated regularization model*:

Algorithm 1 ADMM for the isotropic truncated regularization model (8.2)

1: Initialization: $\mathbf{u}^0, \mathbf{q}^0, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0$;
2: **while** stopping criteria not satisfied **do**
3: Compute $\mathbf{u}^{k+1}$, $\mathbf{q}^{k+1}$ and update $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k+1}$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{u}^{k+1} = \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{u}\in V} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{q}^k; \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k), \tag{8.5}$$

$$\mathbf{q}^{k+1} \in \operatorname*{argmin}_{\mathbf{q}\in Q} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u}^{k+1}, \mathbf{q}; \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k), \tag{8.6}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{k+1} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k + \beta(\mathbf{q}^{k+1} - \nabla\mathbf{u}^{k+1}), \tag{8.7}$$

4: **end while**

$$\min_{\mathbf{u}\in V}\left\{E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{ani}}(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{1\le i,j\le N} \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_x\mathbf{u})_{ij}|) + \mathcal{T}(|(\nabla_y\mathbf{u})_{ij}|) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{f}\|_V^2\right\}, \tag{8.1}$$

- *Isotropic 2D truncated regularization model*:

$$\min_{\mathbf{u}\in V}\left\{E^{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{1\le i,j\le N} \mathcal{T}\left(\sqrt{(\nabla_x\mathbf{u})^2_{ij} + (\nabla_x\mathbf{u})^2_{ij}}\right) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{f}\|_V^2\right\}, \tag{8.2}$$

which are truncated versions of (2.2) and (2.3), respectively.

8.2 ADMM for 2D truncated regularization models

In this paper, we use ADMM to solve the truncated regularization models. ADMM is a very successful method to solve large-scale optimization problems with special structures. Since the methods to solve models (8.1) and (8.2) are very similar, we only explain the details for (8.2) with periodic boundary condition.

In this section, we make an additional assumption about $\rho(\cdot)$:

(AS5) $\rho(s)$ is C^2 on $(0,+\infty)$. $\rho''(s) < 0$ strictly increases on $(0,+\infty)$ or $\rho''(s) \equiv 0$ on $(0,+\infty)$.

Notice that all the regularizer functions in Table 1 satisfy the assumption (AS5).

We first rewrite (8.2) to the following equivalent constrained optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned}&\min_{(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{q})\in V\times Q}\left\{\tilde{E}^{\mathcal{T}}_{\text{iso}}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{1\le i,j\le N} \mathcal{T}(|\mathbf{q}_{ij}|) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{f}\|_V^2\right\},\\ &\text{s.t.}\qquad \mathbf{q} = (\nabla_x\mathbf{u}, \nabla_y\mathbf{u})\end{aligned} \tag{8.3}$$

and define the augmented Lagrangian functional for the problem (8.3) as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{q};\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \sum_{1\le i,j\le N} \mathcal{T}(|\mathbf{q}_{ij}|) + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{f}\|_V^2 + (\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathbf{q}-\nabla\mathbf{u})_Q + \frac{\beta}{2}\|\mathbf{q}-\nabla\mathbf{u}\|_Q^2, \tag{8.4}$$

where $\nabla\mathbf{u} = (\nabla_x\mathbf{u}, \nabla_y\mathbf{u})$; $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in Q$ is the Lagrangian multiplier; and $\beta > 0$ is a constant. The ADMM for solving (8.2) can be described in Algorithm 1.

Remark 13 *The convergence of ADMM for nonconvex problems is a difficult problem. Some results were obtained under some assumptions recently; see [24, 45] and the references therein. We leave the convergence analysis in the future work.*

In each iteration of ADMM, we need to solve the $\mathbf{u}-$sub problem (8.5) and the $\mathbf{q}-$sub problem (8.6). The $\mathbf{u}-$sub problem (8.5) is a quadratic optimization problem, whose optimality condition gives a linear system

$$\alpha \mathbf{A}^{\mathsf{T}}(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{f}) - \nabla^{\mathsf{T}}\boldsymbol{\lambda}^k - \beta\nabla^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{q}^k - \beta\Delta\mathbf{u} = 0,$$

which can be solved by Fourier transform with an FFT implementation [44, 46].

We now design a fast algorithm to find the global minimizer of the nonconvex and nonsmooth $\mathbf{q}-$sub problem (8.6).

8.3 Find the global minimizer of the q−sub problem (8.6)

The problem (8.6) reads

$$\min_{\mathbf{q}\in Q}\left\{\sum_{1\le i,j\le N}\mathcal{T}(|\mathbf{q}_{ij}|) + (\boldsymbol{\lambda}^k, \mathbf{q}-\nabla\mathbf{u}^{k+1})_Q + \frac{\beta}{2}\|\mathbf{q}-\nabla\mathbf{u}^{k+1}\|_Q^2\right\},$$

which is

$$\min_{\mathbf{q}\in Q}\left\{\sum_{1\le i,j\le N}\min\left(\rho(|\mathbf{q}_{ij}|),\rho(\tau)\right) + \frac{\beta}{2}|\mathbf{q}_{i,j}-\mathbf{w}_{i,j}|^2\right\},$$

where $\mathbf{w} = \nabla\mathbf{u}^{k+1} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^k/\beta \in Q$ and by the monotonicity of ρ over $[0,+\infty)$. This problem is separable. Consequently we only need to consider

$$\min_{z\in\mathbb{R}^2}\left\{g(z;w) = \min\left(\rho(|z|),\rho(\tau)\right) + \frac{\beta}{2}|z-w|^2\right\},$$

where $|z| = \sqrt{(z^{(1)})^2+(z^{(2)})^2}$; and $w\in\mathbb{R}^2$, $\tau>0$, $\beta>0$ are given.

Suppose $z^* = \underset{z\in\mathbb{R}^2}{\operatorname{argmin}} g_w(z,w)$. If $w=(0,0)$, it is clear that $z^*=(0,0)$. For w with $|w|\neq 0$, z^* has the same direction as w: $z^* = \frac{|z^*|}{|w|}w$. Thus to obtain z^*, it is enough to calculate $|z^*|$ as the minimizer of the following univariate minimization problem:

$$\min_{s\ge 0}\left\{\chi(s;\tau,\beta,t) = \min\left(\rho(s),\rho(\tau)\right) + \frac{\beta}{2}(s-t)^2\right\}, \tag{8.8}$$

where $t=|w|$. In some special cases such as $\rho(s)=\rho_1(s)$, (8.8) can be explicitly solved [13]. For a general $\rho(\cdot)$ satisfying (AS1)(AS2)(AS3)(AS5), we derive an efficient computational framework.

For convenience of description, we introduce the following two functions

$$\chi_1(s) = \rho(s) + \frac{\beta}{2}(s-t)^2, \tag{8.9}$$

$$\chi_2(s) = \rho(\tau) + \frac{\beta}{2}(s-t)^2. \tag{8.10}$$

Proposition 8.1 *The minimization problem (8.8) can be solved by*

$$s^* = \begin{cases} s_1^*, & \chi_1(s_1^*) < \chi_2(s_2^*), \\ \{s_1^*, s_2^*\}, & \chi_1(s_1^*) = \chi_2(s_2^*), \\ s_2^*, & \chi_1(s_1^*) > \chi_2(s_2^*), \end{cases} \tag{8.11}$$

where

$$s_1^* = \underset{0\le s\le\tau}{\operatorname{argmin}}\,\chi_1(s); s_2^* = \underset{s\ge\tau}{\operatorname{argmin}}\,\chi_2(s) = \max(t,\tau).$$

Proof. It is clear that the (8.11) gives the global minimizer of the problem (8.8). Because $\chi_2(s)$ is a quadratic univariate function, $s_2^* = \underset{s\geq\tau}{\operatorname{argmin}}\, \chi_2(s) = \max(t, \tau)$. ■

To compute s_1^*, we need the first and second order derivatives of χ_1:

$$\chi_1'(s) = \rho'(s) + \beta(s-t);\ \chi_1''(s) = \rho''(s) + \beta,$$

and the following constant

$$s_L = \inf\{s \in (0, +\infty) : \rho''(s) > -\beta\}.$$

Similarly to [30, 9], we have the following second order lower bound theory for the local minimizers of $\chi_1(s)$.

Proposition 8.2 *[second order lower bound] If $\rho(\cdot)$ satisfies (AS1)(AS2)(AS3)(AS5) and s_{loc}^* is a local minimizer of $\min_{s\geq 0}\chi_1(s)$, then either $s_{loc}^* = 0$ or $s_{loc}^* \geq s_L$.*

Proof. The proof can be completed using the second order necessary condition, like [30, 9]. ■

Remark 14 *The constant s_L (lower bound) for some regularization functions can be calculated explicitly. For $\rho_1(s) = s$, we have $s_L = 0$. For $\rho_2(s) = s^p (0 < p < 1)$, we have $s_L = \left(\frac{p(1-p)}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{2-p}}$. For $\rho_3(s) = \ln(\theta s + 1)$, we have $s_L = \max\left(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta}} - \frac{1}{\theta}\right)$. For $\rho_4(s) = \frac{\theta s}{\theta s+1}$, we have $s_L = \max\left(0, \left(\frac{2}{\theta\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} - \frac{1}{\theta}\right)$.*

Remark 15 *When $s_L = 0$, the statement of Proposition 8.2 is a degenerated result, which reads $s_{loc}^* = 0$ or $s_{loc}^* > 0$.*

Since $\rho(\cdot)$ satisfies (AS1)(AS2)(AS3)(AS5), $\chi_1(s)$ is concave in $[0, s_L]$ and strictly convex in $[s_L, +\infty)$. This observation is the key for us to design an efficient method to find the global minimizer of $\chi_1(s)$ over $[0, \tau]$.

Proposition 8.3 *Under the assumptions of Proposition 8.2, we have:*

(1) If $s_L > 0, \chi_1'(s_L) \geq 0$ ($s_L = 0, \chi_1'(0+) \geq 0$), then $s_1^* = 0$ is the unique global minimizer of $\min_{0\leq s\leq\tau}\chi_1(s)$.

(2) If $s_L > 0, \chi_1'(s_L) < 0$ ($s_L = 0, \chi_1'(0+) < 0$), then the equation $\chi_1'(s) = 0$ has a unique root $\bar{s}$ on $[s_L, t]$. Set $\mathcal{X} = \{0, \min(\bar{s}, \tau)\}$. The global minimizer of $\min_{0\leq s\leq\tau}\chi_1(s)$ is given by $s_1^* = \arg\min_{s\in\mathcal{X}}\chi_1(s)$.

Proof. Two cases arise according to the value of s_L.

(C1) When $s_L = 0$, we have $\chi_1''(s) > 0$ on $(0, +\infty)$, thus $\chi_1'(s)$ strictly increases on $(0, +\infty)$.

(i) If $\chi_1'(0+) \geq 0$, we obtain $\chi_1'(s) > 0$ on $(0, +\infty)$, that is $\chi_1(s)$ strictly increases on $(0, +\infty)$. Then 0 is the unique global minimizer of $\min_{0\leq s\leq\tau}\chi_1(s)$.

(ii) If $\chi_1'(0+) < 0$, then $\chi_1'(s) = 0$ has a unique root $\bar{s}$ on $(0, +\infty)$ by the strict monotonicity of $\chi_1'(s)$ and $\chi_1'(s) \to +\infty$ as $s \to +\infty$. Actually, we have $0 = s_L \leq \bar{s} \leq t$, since for $\forall s > 0$, $\rho'(s) \geq 0$ and $\chi_1'(\bar{s}) = \rho'(\bar{s}) + \beta(\bar{s} - t) = 0$. Also, $\min(\bar{s}, \tau)$ is the unique global minimizer of $\min_{0\leq s\leq\tau}\chi_1(s)$.

(C2) When $s_L > 0$, we have $\chi_1''(s) < 0$ on $(0, s_L)$ and $\chi_1''(s) > 0$ on $(s_L, +\infty)$, thus $\chi_1'(s)$ strictly decreases on $(0, s_L)$ and strictly increases on $(s_L, +\infty)$.

(i) If $\chi_1'(s_L) > 0$, then $\chi_1'(s) > 0$ on $(0, +\infty)$, meaning that is $\chi_1(s)$ strictly increases on $(0, +\infty)$. Then 0 is the unique global minimizer of $\min_{0\leq s\leq\tau}\chi_1(s)$.

Algorithm 2 Find the global minimizer of the minimization problem (8.8)

Require: t, τ, the second order bound s_L and functions $\chi_1(s)$, $\chi_1'(s+)$, $\chi_2(s)$;
Ensure: s^*;
1: // Find the global minimizer of $s_1^* = \arg\min_{0\le s\le\tau}\chi_1(s)$.
2: **if** $\chi_1'(s_L+) < 0$ **then**
3: Find the root $\bar{s}$ of equation $\chi_1'(s) = 0$ in $[s_L, t]$;
4: Set the feasible set $\mathcal{X} = \{0, \min(\bar{s}, \tau)\}$;
5: Choose $s_1^* \in \mathcal{X}$ with $s_1^* := \arg\min_{s\in\mathcal{X}}\chi_1(s)$;
6: **else**
7: Set $s_1^* = 0$;
8: **end if**
9: // Find the global minimizer of $s_2^* = \arg\min_{t\le\tau}\chi_2(s)$.
10: Set $s_2^* = \max\{\tau, t\}$;
11: // Find the global minimizer s^*.
12: Choose s^* with

$$s^* = \begin{cases} s_1^*, & \chi_1(s_1^*) < \chi_2(s_2^*), \\ \{s_1^*, s_2^*\}, & \chi_1(s_1^*) = \chi_2(s_2^*), \\ s_2^*, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(ii) If $\chi_1'(s_L) = 0$, then s_L is a critical point but not a local minimizer. $\chi_1'(s) > 0$ on $(0, s_L)$ and $(s_L, +\infty)$, indicating that $\chi_1(s)$ strictly increases on $(0, +\infty)$. Then 0 is the unique global minimizer of $\min_{0\le s\le\tau}\chi_1(s)$.

(iii) If $\chi_1'(s_L) < 0$, then $\min_{s\le 0}\chi_1(s)$ has no local minimizer on $(0, s_L)$ and a unique local minimizer $\bar{s}$ on $[s_L, +\infty)$, i.e., $\chi_1'(\bar{s}) = 0$. Since $\forall s > 0$, $\rho'(s) \ge 0$, and $\chi_1'(\bar{s}) = \rho'(\bar{s}) + \beta(\bar{s} - t) = 0$, it follows that $s_L \le \bar{s} \le t$. Set $\mathcal{X} = \{0, \min(\bar{s}, \tau)\}$. Then the global minimizer of $\min_{s\ge 0}\chi_1(s)$ is given by $\arg\min_{s\in\mathcal{X}}\chi_1(s)$.

The conclusions of (C1) and (C2) show that the global minimizer of $\min_{0\le s\le\tau}\chi_1(s)$ is given by the statement. ■

According to these discussions, we obtain an algorithm to find the global minimizer of (8.8); see Algorithm 2.

Remark 16 *In Algorithm 2, $\bar{s} \in [s_L, t]$ is the unique root of $\chi_1'(s) = 0$ on the interval. It should be pointed out that the equation $\chi_1'(s) = 0$ can be solved analytically in the cases $\rho_1(s)$ and $\rho_2(s)(p = \frac{1}{2}, p = \frac{2}{3})$. In the more general case, no explicit formula has been found. Due to the uniqueness of the root, we can instead effectively numerically solve it in $[s_L, t]$ via any numerical procedure such as Brent's method [6].*

8.4 Numerical Experiments

In this section we provide some numerical examples. We make comparisons between $\rho_1(s) = s$ (TV), $\rho_2(s) = s^p$ ($\ell_p, p < 1$), $\rho_4(s) = \ln(\theta s + 1)$ (LN) and $\rho_5(s) = \frac{\theta s}{\theta s+1}$ (FRAC) and the corresponding truncated versions, TR-TV, TR-ℓ_p, TR-LN and TR-FRAC, as well as the truncated ℓ_2 (TR-ℓ_2), for the variational model (2.2). The last one TR-ℓ_2 results in a smooth at zero potential function, while the others result in nonsmooth at zero functions. Note we do not compare them to the standard ℓ_2 regularization, because it is well known that ℓ_2 regularization cannot preserve image edges. The proposed ADMM is adopted to solve the minimization problems. Inspired by [10] and lots of experiments, we use $\frac{||\bar{\mathbf{u}}^k - \bar{\mathbf{u}}^{k-1}||}{||\mathbf{f}||} \le 5 \times 10^{-5}$, where $\bar{\mathbf{u}}^k := \frac{1}{k+1}\sum_{j=0}^{k}\mathbf{u}^j$ as the stopping condition.

We tested them using a synthetic image "SynRect" (Figure 1(a)) and a "QRcode" (Figure 2(a)). The latter is of an important kind of images in industrial and commercial applications. The test



(a) SynRect. Size: 400 × 400 | (b) TV SNR: 22.26dB | (c) ℓ_p SNR: 26.38dB | (d) LN SNR: 25.69dB | (e) FRAC SNR: 25.33dB

(f) Noisy. SNR: -3.38dB | (g) TR-ℓ_2 SNR: 16.17dB | (h) TR-TV SNR: 24.85dB | (i) TR-ℓ_p SNR: 26.60dB | (j) TR-LN SNR: 26.38dB | (k) TR-FRAC SNR: 26.51dB

Figure 1: Image denoising using different regularizer functions. The first row: original "SynRect" image (a) and denoised images by (b) TV, (c) ℓ_p with $p = 0.5$, (d) LN with $\theta = 15$ and (e) FRAC with $\theta = 50$; the second row: noisy image (f) and denoised images by (g) TR-ℓ_2 with $\tau = 0.1$, (h) TR-TV with $\tau = 0.1$, (i) TR-ℓ_p with $p = 0.5, \tau = 0.2$, (j) TR-LN with $\theta = 15, \tau = 0.12$, and (k) TR-FRAC with $\theta = 50, \tau = 0.12$. Note that ℓ_2 regularizer over smoothes the edges, and therefore we do not put the result here.

on "SynRect" is for image denoising problem; See Figure 1. The noisy observation is shown in Figure 1 (f), which is corrupted by Gaussian noise with $\sigma = 1.e-2$. The first row shows the denoising results by TV, $\ell_p(p = 0.5)$, LN and FRAC regularizers; while the second row includes the results by the truncated regularizers. These results demonstrate that, for a regularization function, its truncated version can obtain better recovery with higher SNR value. Besides, nonsmooth at zero functions generate much better denoising results than the smooth at zero TR-ℓ_2. Comparing the TR-ℓ_2 result to the recovered images in the first row, we can see that the nonsmoothness at zero is crucial for denoising problems.

The test on "QRcode" is for image debluring problem; See Figure 2. The observation is shown in Figure 2(f), which is corrupted by a Gaussian blur $(G, 11, 5)$ and a very low level Gaussian noise with $\sigma = 1.e-4$. The first row shows the debluring results by TV, $\ell_p(p = 0.5)$, LN and FRAC regularizers; while the second row includes the debluring results by the truncated regularizers. These results demonstrate that, for a regularization function, its truncated version can obtain better recovery with higher SNR value. Because there is some little noise in the observation, nonsmoothness at zero is still a benefit and TR-ℓ_2 cannot outperform most nonsmooth at zero regularizers. However, as can be noticed, in image debluring, TR-ℓ_2 outperforms the TV regularization (nonsmooth at zero). This is different to image denoising. The reason is that TR-ℓ_2 is flat on $(\tau, +\infty)$ for some positive τ, while TV regularizer (with constant nonzero first order derivative) is the most non-flat one among all the regularizers in this example.

9 Conclusions and future works

Signal and image restoration is a typical inverse problem. Variational energy minimization methods have been proven very useful. A basic and important energy model is the regularized squared ℓ_2 norm, where the regularization term is a potential function composed of first order difference operators. Various regularization functions have been proposed in the literature, including convex ones, smooth ones, and nonconvex or nonsmooth ones. In this paper, we studied the possibility of contrast-preserving restoration by variational methods. For the sake of clarity, we take a typical example to discuss our idea, with some results extended to

(a) QRcode. Size: 378 × 378 | (b) TV SNR: 27.56dB | (c) ℓ_p SNR: 34.77dB | (d) LN SNR: 34.28dB | (e) FRAC SNR: 33.30dB

(f) Blurry&Noisy. SNR: 5.03dB | (g) TR-ℓ_2 SNR: 29.08dB | (h) TR-TV SNR: 31.69dB | (i) TR-ℓ_p SNR: 35.46dB | (j) TR-LN SNR: 34.59dB | (k) TR-FRAC SNR: 33.40dB

Figure 2: Image deblurring using different regularizer functions. The first row: original "QR-code" image (a) and deblurred images by (b) TV, (c) ℓ_p with $p = 0.5$, (d) LN with $\theta = 20$ and (e) FRAC with $\theta = 10$; the second row: blurry & noisy image (f) and deblurred images by (g) TR-ℓ_2 with $\tau = 0.2$, (h) TR-TV with $\tau = 0.5$, (i) TR-ℓ_p with $p = 0.5, \tau = 0.5$, (j) TR-LN with $\theta = 20, \tau = 0.5$, and (k) TR-FRAC with $\theta = 10, \tau = 0.5$. Note that ℓ_2 regularizer over smoothes the edges, and therefore we do not put the result here.

general cases. We showed that any convex or smooth regularization (satisfying the very basic assumptions in the literature) based variational model is impossible or with low probabilities to preserve edge contrasts. This suggests to try nonconvex and nonsmooth potential functions, especially those flat on $(\tau, +\infty)$ for some positive τ. We then presented a framework based on truncated regularization (with instances TR-$\ell_p, 0 < p \leq 2$ proposed in the literature previously). Some basic analysis in 1D and numerical algorithms in 2D with experiments showed its better contrast-preserving ability. Several problems such as the convergence analysis of the proposed algorithms, and strategies for the choice of parameter τ, are left for future research.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Dr. Chao Zeng to proof read the paper.

References

[1] Gilles Aubert and Pierre Kornprobst. *Mathematical problems in image processing: partial differential equations and the calculus of variations*, volume 147. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

[2] Wei Bian and Xiaojun Chen. Linearly constrained non-lipschitz optimization for image restoration. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 8(4):2294–2322, 2015.

[3] Andrew Blake and Andrew Zisserman. *Visual Reconstruction*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 1987.

[4] C. Bouman and K. Sauer. A generalized gaussian image model for edge-preserving map estimation. *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, 2(3):296–310, Jul 1993.

[5] Kristian Bredies, Karl Kunisch, and Thomas Pock. Total generalized variation. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 3(3):492–526, 2010.

[6] Richard P. Brent. Chapter 4: An algorithm with guaranteed convergence for finding a zero of a function. In *Algorithms for Minimization without Derivatives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

[7] Antonin Chambolle and Pierre-Louis Lions. Image recovery via total variation minimization and related problems. *Numer. Math.*, 76(2):167–188, Apr 1997.

[8] P. Charbonnier, L. Blanc-Feraud, G. Aubert, and M. Barlaud. Deterministic edge-preserving regularization in computed imaging. *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, 6(2):298–311, Feb 1997.

[9] Xiaojun Chen, Fengmin Xu, and Yinyu Ye. Lower bound theory of nonzero entries in solutions of $\ell_2 - \ell_p$ minimization. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 32(5):2832–2852, 2010.

[10] Bin Dong and Yong Zhang. An efficient algorithm for ℓ_0 minimization in wavelet frame based image restoration. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 54(2-3):350–368, Feb 2013.

[11] S. Durand and M. Nikolova. Stability of the minimizers of least squares with a non-convex regularization. part I: Local behavior. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 53(2):185–208, Mar 2006.

[12] S. Durand and M. Nikolova. Stability of the minimizers of least squares with a non-convex regularization. part II: Global behavior. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 53(3):259–277, May 2006.

[13] Massimo Fornasier and Rachel Ward. Iterative thresholding meets free-discontinuity problems. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 10(5):527–567, 2010.

[14] D. Geman and G. Reynolds. Constrained restoration and the recovery of discontinuities. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 14(3):367–383, Mar 1992.

[15] D. Geman and Chengda Yang. Nonlinear image recovery with half-quadratic regularization. *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, 4(7):932–946, Jul 1995.

[16] S. Geman and D. Geman. Stochastic relaxation, gibbs distributions, and the bayesian restoration of images. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, PAMI-6(6):721–741, Nov 1984.

[17] S. Geman and D. E. McClure. Statistical methods for tomographic image reconstruction. *Bull. Intl. Statist. Inst.*, LII(4), 1987.

[18] P. J. Green. Bayesian reconstructions from emission tomography data using a modified em algorithm. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, 9(1):84–93, Mar 1990.

[19] T. Hebert and R. Leahy. A generalized em algorithm for 3-d bayesian reconstruction from poisson data using gibbs priors. *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, 8(2):194–202, Jun 1989.

[20] Michael Hintermüller and Tao Wu. Nonconvex TV^q-models in image restoration: Analysis and a trust-region regularization–based superlinearly convergent solver. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 6(3):1385–1415, 2013.

[21] Vladimir Kolmogorov, Thomas Pock, and Michal Rolinek. Total variation on a tree. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 9(2):605–636, Jan 2016.

[22] Alessandro Lanza, Serena Morigi, and Fiorella Sgallari. Constrained TV_p-ℓ_2 model for image restoration. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 68(1):64–91, 2016.

[23] Yvan G. Leclerc. Constructing simple stable descriptions for image partitioning. *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, 3(1):73–102, 1989.

[24] Guoyin Li and Ting Kei Pong. Global convergence of splitting methods for nonconvex composite optimization. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 25(4):2434–2460, Jan 2015.

[25] Yifei Lou, Tieyong Zeng, Stanley Osher, and Jack Xin. A weighted difference of anisotropic and isotropic total variation model for image processing. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 8(3):1798–1823, 2015.

[26] Yves Meyer. *Oscillating Patterns in Image Processing and Nonlinear Evolution Equations: The Fifteenth Dean Jacqueline B. Lewis Memorial Lectures*, volume 22 of *University lecture series*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 2001.

[27] Jean Michel Morel and Sergio Solimini. *Variational Methods in Image Segmentation*, volume 14. Birkhuser Boston, 1995.

[28] David Mumford and Jayant Shah. Optimal approximations by piecewise smooth functions and associated variational problems. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 42(5):577–685, 1989.

[29] Mila Nikolova. A variational approach to remove outliers and impulse noise. *J. Math. Imaging Vision*, 20(1):99–120, 2004.

[30] Mila Nikolova. Analysis of the recovery of edges in images and signals by minimizing nonconvex regularized least-squares. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 4(3):960–991, Jan 2005.

[31] Mila Nikolova. Analytical bounds on the minimizers of (nonconvex) regularized least-squares. *Inverse Probl. Imaging*, 2(1):133–149, 2008.

[32] Mila Nikolova. Description of the minimizers of least squares regularized with ℓ_0-norm. Uniqueness of the global minimizer. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 6(2):904–937, 2013.

[33] Mila Nikolova, Michael K. Ng, and Chi-Pan Tam. Fast nonconvex nonsmooth minimization methods for image restoration and reconstruction. *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, 19(12):3073–3088, Dec 2010.

[34] Mila Nikolova, Michael K Ng, Shuqin Zhang, and Wai-ki Ching. Efficient reconstruction of piecewise constant images using nonsmooth nonconvex minimization. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 1(1):2–25, 2008.

[35] Peter Ochs, Yunjin Chen, Thomas Brox, and Thomas Pock. iPiano: Inertial proximal algorithm for nonconvex optimization. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 7(2):1388–1419, 2014.

[36] Peter Ochs, Alexey Dosovitskiy, Thomas Brox, and Thomas Pock. On iteratively reweighted algorithms for nonsmooth nonconvex optimization in computer vision. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 8(1):331–372, 2015.

[37] P. Perona and J. Malik. Scale-space and edge detection using anisotropic diffusion. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 12(7):629–639, Jul 1990.

[38] Leonid I. Rudin, Stanley Osher, and Emad Fatemi. Nonlinear total variation based noise removal algorithms. *Phys. D*, 60(1-4):259–268, Nov 1992.

[39] S. S. Saquib, C. A. Bouman, and K. Sauer. Ml parameter estimation for markov random fields with applications to bayesian tomography. *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, 7(7):1029–1044, Jul 1998.

[40] Otmar Scherzer(Ed.). *Handbook of Mathematical Methods in Imaging*. Springer, 2015.

[41] Emmanuel Soubies, Laure Blanc-Féraud, and Gilles Aubert. A continuous exact ℓ_0 penalty (CEL0) for least squares regularized problem. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 8(3):1607–1639, 2015.

[42] Andrej Nikolaevich Tikhonov and Vasiliy Yakovlevich Arsenin. *Solutions of ill-posed problems*. V. H. Winston & Sons, 1977.

[43] C. R. Vogel and M. E. Oman. Iterative methods for total variation denoising. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 17(1):227–238, 1996.

[44] Yilun Wang, Junfeng Yang, Wotao Yin, and Yin Zhang. A new alternating minimization algorithm for total variation image reconstruction. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 1(3):248–272, Jan 2008.

[45] Yu Wang, Wotao Yin, and Jinshan Zeng. Global convergence of admm in nonconvex nonsmooth optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06324v3*, 2015.

[46] Chunlin Wu and Xue-Cheng Tai. Augmented lagrangian method, dual methods, and split bregman iteration for rof, vectorial tv, and high order models. *SIAM J. Imaging Sci.*, 3(3):300–339, Jan 2010.

[47] Z. Xu, X. Chang, F. Xu, and H. Zhang. $L_{1/2}$ regularization: A thresholding representation theory and a fast solver. *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, 23(7):1013–1027, Jul 2012.